



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं. 6]
No. 6]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, जनवरी 5, 1983/माघ 16, 1904
NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1983/MAGHA 16, 1904

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अपने संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके
Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (II)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (II)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों द्वारा जारी किए गए ताबिधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएँ
Statutory Orders and Notifications Issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(other than the Ministry of Defence)

गृह मंत्रालय
आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 15 जनवरी, 1983

कां. आं. 745:—संघ राज्य क्षेत्र शासन अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का. 20) की धारा 27 की उपधारा (3) के खंड (क) के अनुसरण में तथा भारत सरकार के गृह मंत्रालय की तारीख 4 सितम्बर, 1979 की अधिसूचना संख्या एस० आं० 3234 का अधिकरण करते हुए, राष्ट्रपति यह अवधारित करते हैं कि वित्तीय वर्ष 1982-83 के लिए और अप्रैल, 1983 के प्रथम दिन को या उसके पश्चात् होने वाले हर एक वित्तीय वर्ष के लिए, गोवा, दमन और दीव के प्रशासक के पद से संबंधित निम्नलिखित पदों पर व्यय, प्रशासक की परिलब्धियों और भत्तों से भिन्न की राशि क्रमशः 8 लाख रुपए और 7.00 लाख रुपए से अधिक न होगी, अर्थात्

1. प्रशासक के कर्मचारीवृन्द और घरेलू साज-सामान ;
2. प्रशासक की मोटर और अन्य गाड़ियाँ ;
3. प्रशासक के निवास स्थान का मूल निर्माण और उसका अनुरक्षण -
4. प्रशासक का लिपिकीय कर्मचारी वृन्द ;

परन्तु यदि किसी वित्तीय वर्ष में प्रशासक के कार्यालय के कर्मचारीवृन्द की परिलब्धियों में ऐसी वृद्धि, जो बेतन वृद्धियों के प्रोद्भूत या सरकार द्वारा समय-समय पर मंजूर किए गए भत्तों में वृद्धि के परिणामस्वरूप, खर्च उक्त राशियों से बढ़ जाता है तो उक्त राशियों उस वृद्धि के परिणाम तक बढ़ाई हुई समझी जाएंगी।

[सं० यू-11012/2/82-यू० टी० एन०]

आर०वी० पिल्ले, संयुक्त सचिव

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS ORDER

New Delhi, the 15th January, 1983

S.O. 745.—In pursuance of clause (a) of sub-section (3) of section 27 of the Government of Union Territory Act, 1963 (20 of 1963), and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Home Affairs No. S.O. 3234 dated the 4th September, 1979, the President hereby determines that for the financial year of 1982-83 and for each of the financial years commencing on and after the 1st day of April, 1983 the expenditure on the following items relating to the office of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu, other than the Administrator's emoluments and allowances, shall be a sum not exceeding Rs. 8.00 lakhs and Rs. 7.00 lakhs respectively namely :—

- (i) Staff and House-hold of the Administrator ;
- (ii) Motor and other vehicles of the Administrator ;
- (iii) Original works and maintenance of the residence of the Administrator ; and
- (iv) Secretarial staff of the Administrator ;

Provided that, if, in any financial year, the expenditure exceeds the said sums consequent on increase in the emoluments of the staff of the office of the Administrator, such increase being occasioned by accrual of increments, or increase in the allowances sanctioned by the Government from time to time, the said sum shall be deemed to be raised to the extent of such increase.

[No. U-11012/2/82-UTJ]
R. V. PILLAI, Jt. Secy.

वित्त मंत्रालय

केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क और सीमा शुल्क बोर्ड

सं० 10/83-सीमा शुल्क

नई दिल्ली, 29 जनवरी, 1983

का० भा० 746:—केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क और सीमा शुल्क बोर्ड सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 52) की धारा 9 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए पंजाब राज्य में जिला रोपर, में एस० ए० एस० नगर को भाण्डागार स्टेशन के रूप में घोषित करता है।

[फा० सं० 473/13/83-सीमा शुल्क-7]

एन० के० कपूर, प्रवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

CENTRAL BOARD OF EXCISE AND CUSTOMS

No. 10/83-CUSTOMS

New Delhi, the 29th January, 1983

S.O. 746.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 9 of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962), the Central Board of Excise and Customs hereby declares S.A.S. Nagar, District Ropar, in the State of Punjab, to be a warehousing station.

[F. No. 473/13/83-Cus. VII]
N. K. KAPUR, Under Secy.

केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड

शुद्धि-पत्र

नई दिल्ली, 17 जनवरी, 1983

आय-कर

का० भा० 747.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 122 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष-कर बोर्ड एतद्वारा निदेश देता है कि बोर्ड की दिनांक 13-5-1982 की अधिसूचना सं० 3951 (फा० सं० 261/12/81-आ० क० न्या०), दिनांक 19-5-1981 के बजाय 1-5-1981 से लागू होगी।

[सं० 5055/फा० सं० 261/18/82-आ० क० न्या०]

CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES

CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 17th January, 1983

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 747.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of Section 122 of the I.T. Act, 1961, the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby directs that Board's notification No. 3951 (F. No. 261/12/81-ITJ) dated 13-5-1982 shall be effective from 1-5-1981 instead of 19-5-1981.

[No. 5055/F. No. 261/18/82-ITJ]

का० भा० 748.—बोर्ड की दिनांक 30-5-1982 की अधिसूचना सं० 3424 (फा० सं० 261/14/80-आ० क० न्या०) में, उसकी अनुसूची के स्तम्भ 2 में, प्रपीलीय सहायक

प्रायुक्त, पुणे रेंज, पुणे के सामने 1-12-1982 से निम्नलिखित जोड़ा जाएगा :

32 एस० एस० सी० III, पुणे।

[सं० 5056/फा० सं० 261/36/82-आ० क० न्या०]

S.O. 748.—In the Board's Notification No. 3424 (F. No. 261/14/80-ITJ) dated 30-5-1982 in column 2 of the Schedule thereto the following shall be added w.e.f. 1-12-1982 against AAC, Pune Range, Pune :

32. SSC III, Pune.

[No. 5056/F. No. 261/36/82-ITJ]

का० भा० 749.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 122 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों और इस संवत् में के० प्र० बोर्ड को अधिकार देने वाली अन्य सभी शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड, नई दिल्ली एतद्वारा, दिनांक 27-8-82 की अधिसूचना सं० 4881 (फा० सं० 261/9/82-आ० क० न्या०) से संबद्ध अनुसूची में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करता है।

उक्त अनुसूची में प्रपीलीय सहायक प्रायुक्त, ए-रेंज, जबलपुर के सामने, स्तम्भ सं० 2 के अन्तर्गत, निम्नलिखित जोड़ा जाएगा :

"19. प्रतिरिक्त आयकर अधिकारी,

जी वार्ड, जबलपुर"

यह अधिसूचना 29-11-82 से लागू होगी।

[सं० 5057/फा० सं० 261/9/82-आ० क० न्या०]

S.O. 749.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 122 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and all other powers enabling it in this behalf, the Central Board of Direct Taxes, New Delhi hereby make the following amendment in the Schedule appended to its Notification No. 4881 dated the 27-8-1982 (F. No. 261/9/82-ITJ). In the said schedule against A.A.C. A-Range, Jabalpur there shall be added the following under column No. 2

"19. Additional Income-tax Officer, G-Ward, Jabalpur."

This Notification shall take effect from 29-11-82.

[No. 5057/F. No. 261/9/82-ITJ]

शुद्धि-पत्र

का० भा० 750.—बोर्ड की दिनांक 3-11-82 की अधिसूचना सं० 4958 (फा० सं० 261/33/82—आ० क० न्या०), 1-11-82 के बजाय 2-11-82 से लागू होगी।

[सं० 5058/फा० सं० 261/33/82-आ० क० न्या०]

के०एम० सुलतान, प्रवर सचिव

CORRIGENDUM

S.O. 750.—Board's notification No. 4958 dated 3-11-82 (F. No. 261/33/82-ITJ) shall be affective from 2-11-82 instead of 1-11-82.

[No. 5058/F. No. 261/33/82-ITJ]

K. M. SULTAN, Under Secy.

केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क समाहर्तालय : कलकत्ता

केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क

अधिसूचना नं० 1/के०-उ०/1983

कलकत्ता, 17 जनवरी, 1983

का० भा० 751.—केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क नियमावली, 1944 के नियम 5 (यहाँ के बाढ़ "उक्त नियम" कहा गया है) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैं, बी० एन० रंमानी, समाहर्ता, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क कलकत्ता एतद्वारा केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क समाहर्तालय : कलकत्ता के ज्ञात-

धिकार में कार्यरत केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क के सहायक सहभाजियों को अपने क्षेत्राधिकार में उक्त नियमावली के नियम 56 कक के अधीन शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करता हूँ।

[सं० सं० 4(8)1-के० उ०/82]

बी० एन० रंगवानी, समाह्वी

COLLECTORATE OF CENTRAL EXCISE, CALCUTTA

Central Excise

NOTIFICATION NO. 1/CE/1983

Calcutta, the 17th January, 1983

S.O. 751.—In exercise of the powers conferred upon me as the collector of Central Excise, Calcutta, under rule 5 of the Central Excise Rules, 1944, (hereinafter referred to as "the said Rules"), I, B. N. Rangwani, Collector of Central Excise, Calcutta, hereby authorise the Assistant Collectors of Central Excise working within the jurisdiction of the Collectorate of Central Excise, Calcutta, to exercise the powers of the Collector of Central Excise, Calcutta, under rule 56AA of the said Rules in their respective jurisdictions.

[C. No. IV(8)1-CE/82]

B. N. RANGWANI, Collector

(आर्थिक कार्य विभाग)

(बैंकिंग प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 15 जनवरी, 1983

का० आ० 752.—प्रादेशिक ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा 11 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा श्री ए० के० मजूमदार को बस्तर क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक जगदलपुर का अध्यक्ष नियुक्त करती है तथा 01-01-83 से प्रारम्भ होकर 31-12-1983 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि को उस अवधि के रूप में निर्धारित करती है जिसके दौरान श्री ए० के० मजूमदार अध्यक्ष के रूप में कार्य करेंगे।

[सं० एफ० 2-60/82-आर० आर०बी०]

(Department of Economic Affairs)

(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 15th January, 1983

S.O. 752.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 11 of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri A. K. Majumdar as the Chairman of the Bastar Kshetriya Gramin Bank, Jagdalpur and specifies the period commencing on the 1-1-1983 and ending with the 31-12-1983 as the period for which the said Shri A. K. Majumdar shall hold office as such Chairman.

[No. F. 2-60/82-RRB]

नई दिल्ली, 19 जनवरी, 1983

का० आ० 753.—प्रादेशिक ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा 11 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा श्री के० एन० गंडा को जामनगर ग्रामीण बैंक, जामनगर का अध्यक्ष नियुक्त करती है तथा 1-2-1983 से

प्रारम्भ होकर 31-1-1986 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि को उस अवधि के रूप में निर्धारित करती है जिसके दौरान श्री के० एन० गंडा अध्यक्ष के रूप में कार्य करेंगे।

[संख्या एफ० 2-51/82-आर० आर०बी०]

राम बेहरा, भवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 19th January, 1983

S.O. 753.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 11 of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri K. N. Ganda as the Chairman of the Jamnagar Gramin Bank Jamnagar and specifies the period commencing on the 1-2-1983 and ending with the 31.1.1986 as the period for which the said Shri K. N. Ganda shall hold office as such Chairman.

[No. F. 2-51/82-RRB]

RAAM BEHRA, Under Secy.

नयी दिल्ली, 21 जनवरी, 1983

का० आ० 754.—बैंकारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर एतद्वारा घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 19 की उपधारा (2) के उपबंध इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से एक वर्ष के लिए यूनाइटेड बैंक ऑफ इंडिया, कलकत्ता पर उस सीमा तक लागू नहीं होंगे जहां तक इनका संबंध यूनाइटेड इंडस्ट्रियल बैंक लिमिटेड, कलकत्ता में इसके शेयरों की धारिता से है।

[सं० 15/20/82-बीओ-3]

एल० आर० कटारिया, भवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 21st January, 1983

S.O. 754.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of sub-section (2) of section 19 of the said Act shall not apply to the United Bank of India, Calcutta for one year from the date of notification in respect of its holding of the shares in the United Industrial Bank Ltd., Calcutta.

[No. 15/20/82-BO. III]

L. R. KATARIA, Under Secy.

वाणिज्य मंत्रालय

(संयुक्त मुख्य निबंधक आयात तथा निर्यात का कार्यालय)

जावेद

मद्रास, 18 दिसम्बर, 1982

का० आ० 755.—सर्वश्री बोक्यू टायरीस लिमिटेड, पुदुच्चाक्कम जिलेज, 603103, बेंगलुरु जिल्ला को, रुपये 205598 तक, अप्रैल—मार्च 1982 की आयात नीति के पैरा 138 के अन्तर्गत अनुमति यहाँ का आयात करने के लिए आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी०एल० 2849679-सी-एक्स एच०-80 एम-81 दिनांक 8-9-1981 जारी किया गया था।

उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस (मुद्रा विनियम निबंधन प्रति) आवेदक के बैंक, घरेलू इंडियन बैंक होसूर शाखा, मद्रास-600001 के द्वारा अस्थानस्थ हो जाने के बारे में विचार करने का काम धिक्काई दिया और आवेदक ने इस संबंध में अपेक्षित शपथपत्र भी दाखिल किया है। मैं, इस बात से संतुष्ट हूँ कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस (मुद्रा विनियम निबंधन प्रति) बैंक द्वारा खो दी गयी है। उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की मूल्य में रुपये 71,065

को छोड़कर रुपये 134531 का उपयोग कर लिया गया है और छोड़े गये रुपये 71,065 का आयात लाइसेंस (मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति) की अनुलिपि प्रति संख्या 2454796 दिनांक 30-11-82 प्रत्यक्ष जारी किया गया है।

मैं, 1982-83 की आयात-निर्यात क्रियाविधि पुस्तक के पैरा 352 और 356 के अंतर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए सर्वश्री बाक्यु टानरीस लिमिटेड, पुदुप्पाक्कम बिल्डिंग, चिंगलपुट जिल्ला को, 1982-83 की आयात नाति के पैरा 138 में दर्शाई गयी शर्तों के आयात करने के लिए जारी किये गये लाइसेंस संख्या पी-जेड-1936117-सी-एक्सएक्स-82-एम-81 दिनांक 8-9-81 को मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति की एतद् द्वारा रद्द करता हूँ।

[संख्या : डा. आ. 195/लाइसेंस/मार्च/81-एम 82/एन पी एस बा-2]
डा.एस. नरसिम्हिया, उप मुख्य-नियंत्रक, आयात तथा निर्यात

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

(Office of the Jt. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Madras)

ORDERS

Madras, the 18th December, 1982

Sub :—Cancellation of Exchange Control Copy of the Licence No. P/L/2949679 dated 8-9-81-M/S. Bokiya Tanneries Limited, Pudupakkam.

S.O. 755.—M/s. Bokiya Tanneries Limited, Pudupakkam Village, 603103, Chingleput District, were granted an Import Licence No. P/L/2949679/C/XX/80/M/81 dated 8-9-1981 for import of items permissible under Para 138 of Import Policy for 1981-82 for Rs. 205596.

There was reason to believe that the above import licence (Exchange Control Copy) has been misplaced by the firm's Bankers i.e. Indian Bank, Harbour Branch, Madras-600001 and the firm has also furnished a requisite affidavit to that effect. I am satisfied that the above import licence (Exchange Control Copy) has been lost by the Bank. The original Exchange Control Copy of the above licence has been utilised to the extent of Rs. 134531 leaving a balance of Rs. 71,065 for which amount a duplicate Import Licence No. 2454796/C/XX/(Exchange Control Copy only) dated 30-11-82 has since been issued.

I, in exercise of the powers vested in me in terms of para 352 and 356 of the Hand Book of Import-Export Procedure 1982-83, hereby cancel the Exchange Control Copy of the Licence No. P/L/2949679/C/XX/80/M/81 dated 8-9-81 issued to M/s. Bokiya Tanneries Ltd., Pudupakkam Village, Chingleput District, for import of items under para 138 of the Import Policy for 1981-82.

JF. No. DR/195/Lic/April 81/AM 82/SPS. V 2f

D. S. NARASIMHIAH, Dy. Chief Controller
of Imports and Exports

मद्रास, 2 दिसम्बर, 1982

का० आ० 756. —सर्वश्री लक्ष्मी एंटरप्राइजस, 83, वी० आर० पिल्लै स्ट्रीट, मद्रास 600005 को, रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी जेड 1936118 सी एक्सएक्स 82 एम 81 दिनांक 6-3-82 जारी किया गया था।

उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस सनदी लेखापाल द्वारा भूतपूर्व आयात के प्रमाणपत्र जारी करने के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है। उस प्रमाणपत्र के अवास्तविकता के बारे में विश्वास करने का कारण दिखाई देने से, पार्टी से यह पूछते हुए एक कारण बताओ नोटिस जारी किया गया था कि 22-7-82 को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई का अवसर देने के पश्चात् उनकी जारी किया गया लाइसेंस क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाए। अपने मामले को स्पष्ट करने व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए पार्टी न आने के कारण, मैं इस बात से संतुष्ट हूँ कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस गलत सनदी लेखापाल प्रमाणपत्र के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है और एतद्द्वारा लाइसेंस को रद्द करने की एक-पक्षीय निर्णय लेता हूँ।

मैं, आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 की धारा 9(1) (ए) के अंतर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सर्वश्री लक्ष्मी एंटरप्राइजस, 83, वी० आर० पिल्लै स्ट्रीट, मद्रास-600005 को, मार्च—मार्च 1982 की अवधि के लिए रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए जारी किये गये लाइसेंस संख्या पी-जेड-1936118-सी-एक्सएक्स-82 एम-81 दिनांक 6-3-82 को एतद् द्वारा रद्द करता हूँ।

[संख्या : डीएफ-1274-एम 82-एयू 3]

Madras, the 2nd September, 1982

S.O. 756.—M/s. Laxmi Enterprises, 83, V. R. Pillai Street, Madras-600005, were granted a Licence No. P/Z/1936118/C/XX/82/M/81 dated 6th March, 1982 for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000.

As there was a reason to believe that the above import licence has been obtained by producing a Chartered Accountant Certificate certifying their past imports which was not genuine, a Show Cause Notice was issued calling upon the Licence Holder to Show Cause why action should not be taken to cancel the licence giving an opportunity for a Personal Hearing on 22nd July, 1982. As the party did not turn up for a personal hearing to explain his case. I am satisfied that the above Import Licence has been obtained by fraudulent means and hereby decide to cancel the licence ex-parte.

I, in exercise of the powers vested on me in terms of Clause 9(1)(a) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955, hereby cancel the Import Licence No. P/Z/1936118/C/XX/82/M/81 dated 6th March, 1982 issued to M/s. Laxmi Enterprises, 83- V. R. Pillai Street, Madras-600005, for import of Dry Fruit for Rs. 10,000 for April—March, 1982 period.

[F. No. DG/1274/AM. 82/AU. III]

मद्रास, 2 दिसम्बर, 1982

का० आ० 757. —सर्वश्री श्री बालाजी एजेंसी, नम्बर 3, अन्तर्जगम नगर, जाफरखानपेट, मद्रास-600095 को रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी-जेड-1936117-सी-एक्सएक्स-82-एम-81 दिनांक 6-3-82 जारी किया गया था।

उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस सनदी लेखापाल द्वारा भूतपूर्व आयात के प्रमाणपत्र जारी करने के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है। उस प्रमाणपत्र के अवास्तविकता के बारे में विश्वास करने का

कारण दिखाई देने से, पार्टी से यह पूछते हुए एक कारण बताओ नोटिस जारी किया गया था कि 25-6-82 को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई का अवसर देने के पश्चात् उनको जारी किया गया लाइसेंस क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाए। अपने मामले में स्पष्ट करने व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए पार्टी न आने के कारण, मैं इस बात से संतुष्ट हूँ कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस गलत सनदी लेखापाल प्रमाणपत्र के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है और एतद्वारा लाइसेंस को रद्द करने की एक-पक्षीय निर्णय लेता हूँ।

मैं, आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश 1955 की धारा 9(1) (ए) के अंतर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सर्वश्री बालाजी एजेंसीस, नम्बर 3, अनजुगम नगर, जाफरखानपेट, मद्रास-600095 को, अप्रैल-मार्च 1982 की अवधि के लिए रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए जारी किये गये लाइसेंस संख्या पी-जेड-1936117-सी-एक्स एक्स-82-एम-81 दिनांक 6-3-82 को एतद् द्वारा रद्द करता हूँ।

[संख्या डीएफ/1275/एम 82/एयू 3]

Madras, 2nd December, 1982

S.O. 757.—M/s. Sri Balaji Agencies, No. 3, Anjugam Nagar, Jafarkhanpet, Madras-600095 were granted a Licence No. P/Z/1936117/C/XX/82/M/81-dated 6th March, 1983 for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000.

As there was a reason to believe that the above import licence has been obtained by producing a Chartered Accountant Certificate certifying their past imports which was not genuine, a Show Cause Notice was issued calling upon the licence holder to show cause why action should not be taken to cancel the licence giving an opportunity for a personal hearing on 15th June, 1982. As the party did not turn up for a personal hearing to explain his case, I am satisfied that the above Import Licence has been obtained by fraudulent means and hereby decide to cancel the licence ex-parte.

I, in exercise of the powers vested on me in terms of Clause 9(1)(a) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955, hereby cancel the Import Licence No. P/Z/1936117/C/XX/82/M/81 dated 6th March, 1982 issued to M/s. Sri Balaji Agencies, No. 3, Anjugam Nagar, Jafarkhanpet, Madras-600095 for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000 for April—March, 1982 period.

[F. No. DF/1275/AM. 82/AU. III]

मद्रास, 14 दिसम्बर, 1982

का० आ० 758.—सर्वश्री शिवा एजेंसीस, 226, गोविंदप्प नाईकन स्ट्रीट, मद्रास-1 को रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी-जेड-1936040-सी-एक्सएक्स-82-एम-81 दिनांक 4-3-82 जारी किया गया था।

उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस सनदी लेखापाल द्वारा भूतपूर्व आयात के प्रमाणपत्र जारी करने के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है। उस प्रमाणपत्र के अवास्तविकता के बारे में विश्वास करने का कारण दिखाई देने से, पार्टी से यह पूछते हुए एक कारण बताओ नोटिस जारी किया गया था कि 27-11-82 को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई का अवसर देने के पश्चात् उनको जारी किया गया लाइसेंस क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाए। अपने मामले

को स्पष्ट करने व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए पार्टी न आने के कारण, मैं इस बात से संतुष्ट हूँ कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस गलत सनदी लेखापाल प्रमाणपत्र के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है और एतद्वारा लाइसेंस को रद्द करने की एक-पक्षीय निर्णय लेता हूँ।

मैं, आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश 1955 की धारा 9(1) (ए) के अंतर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग कर हुए, सर्वश्री शिवा एजेंसीस, 226, गोविंदप्प नाईकन स्ट्रीट, मद्रास-1 को अप्रैल-मार्च 1982 की अवधि के लिए रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए जारी किये गये आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी-जेड-1936040-सी-एक्सएक्स-82-एम-81 दिनांक 4-3-82 को एतद्वारा रद्द करता हूँ।

[संख्या डीएफ/1168/एम 82/एयू 3]

Madras, the 14th December, 1982

S.O. 758.—M/s. Siva Agencies, 226, Govindapur Naicken Street, Madras-1, were granted a licence P/Z/1936040/C/XX/82/M/81 dated 4th March, 1982 for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000.

As there was a reason to believe that the above import licence has been obtained by producing a Chartered Accountant Certificate certifying their past imports which was not genuine, a show cause notice was issued calling upon the licence holder to show cause why action should not be taken to cancel the licence giving an opportunity for a personal hearing on 24th April, 1982. As the party did not turn up for a Personal Hearing to explain his case, I am satisfied that the above Import Licence has been obtained by fraudulent means and hereby decide to cancel the licence ex-parte.

I, in exercise of the powers vested on me in terms of Clause 9(1)(a) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955, hereby cancel the Import Licence No. P/Z/1936040/C/XX/82/M/81 dated 4th March, 1982 issued to M/s. Siva Agencies, 226, Govindappa Naicken Street, Madras-1 for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000 for April—March, 1982 period.

[No. DF/1168/AM. 82/AU. III]

मद्रास, 17 दिसम्बर, 1982

का० आ० 759.—सर्वश्री निवास एजेंसीज, 3, सामी चेंद्री स्ट्रीट, कोमलेश्वरनपेट, मद्रास-2 को रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी-जेड-1936210-सी-एक्सएक्स-32-एम-31 दिनांक 22-3-82 जारी किया गया था।

उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस सनदी लेखापाल द्वारा भूतपूर्व आयात के प्रमाणपत्र जारी करने के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है। उस प्रमाणपत्र के अवास्तविकता के बारे में विश्वास करने का कारण दिखाई देने से, पार्टी से यह पूछते हुए एक कारण बताओ नोटिस जारी किया गया था कि 30-11-82 को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई का अवसर देने के पश्चात् उनको जारी किया गया लाइसेंस क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाए। अपने मामले को स्पष्ट करने व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए पार्टी न आने के कारण, मैं इस बात से संतुष्ट हूँ कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस गलत सनदी लेखापाल प्रमाणपत्र के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है और एतद्वारा लाइसेंस को रद्द करने की एक पक्षीय निर्णय लेता हूँ।

मैं, आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश 1955 की धारा 9(1) (ए) के अन्तर्गत प्रवृत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सर्वश्री निवास एजन्सीस, 3, सामी चेट्टी स्ट्रीट, कोमलेश्वरनपेट, मद्रास-600002 को अप्रैल-मार्च 1982 की अवधि के लिए रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए जारी किये गये लाइसेंस संख्या पी जेड-1936210-सी-एक्सएक्स-82-एम-81 दिनांक 22-3-1982 को एतद्द्वारा रद्द करता हूँ।

[नं० डीएफ/1187/एम 82/एयू 3]

Madras, the 17th December, 1982

S.O. 759.—M/s. Nivas Agencies, 3, Samy Chetty St. Komaleswaranpet, Madras-2 were granted a Licence No. P/Z/1936210/C|XX|82|M|81 dated 22-3-82 for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000.

As there was a reason to believe that the above import licence has been obtained by producing a Chartered Accountant Certificate certifying their past imports which was not genuine a Show cause Notice was issued calling upon the Licence Holder to show cause why action should not be taken to cancel the licence giving an opportunity for a Personal Hearing on 30-11-82. As the party did not turn up for a Personal Hearing to explain his case, I am satisfied that the above Import Licence has been obtained by fraudulent means and hereby decide to cancel the licence ex-parte.

I, in exercise of the powers vested on me in terms of clause 9(1)(a) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955, hereby cancel the Import Licence No. P/Z/1936210/C|XX|82/M/81 dated 22-3-82 issued to M/s. Nivas Agencies 3, Samy Chetty St, Komaleswaranpet, Madras-600002 for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000 for April—March 1982 Period.

[No. DF/1187/AM. 82/AU. III]

का०आ० 760:—सर्वश्री आनन्द प्राविजन्स, 11, जुबिली रोड, वेस्ट माम्बलम, मद्रास-600033 को रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी जेड-1935974-सी-एक्सएक्स-82-एम-81 दिनांक 2-3-1982 जारी किया गया था।

उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस सनदी लेखापाल द्वारा भूतपूर्व आयात के प्रमाणपत्र जारी करने के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है। उस प्रमाणपत्र के अवास्तविकता के बारे में विश्वास करने का कारण दिखाई देने से, पार्टी से यह पूछते हुए एक कारण बताओ नोटिस जारी किया गया था कि 16-11-82 को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई का अवसर देने के पश्चात उनको जारी किया गया लाइसेंस क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाए। अपने मामले को स्पष्ट करने व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए पार्टी न आने के कारण मैं इस बात से संतुष्ट हूँ कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस गलत सनदी लेखापाल प्रमाणपत्र के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है और एतद्द्वारा लाइसेंस को रद्द करने की एक-पक्षीय निर्णय लेता हूँ।

मैं, आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश 1955 की धारा 9(1) (ए) के अन्तर्गत प्रवृत्त अधिकारी का प्रयोग करते हुए, सर्वश्री आनन्द प्राविजन्स, 11, जुबिली रोड, वेस्ट माम्बलम, मद्रास-600033 को, अप्रैल-मार्च 1982 की अवधि के लिए

रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए जारी किये गये लाइसेंस संख्या पी जेड-1935974-सी-एक्सएक्स-82-एम-81 दिनांक 2-3-1982 को एतद्द्वारा रद्द करता हूँ।

[सं० डीएफ/1072/एम 82/एयू 3]

S.O. 760.—M/s. Anand Provisions, 11 Jubilee Road, West Mambalam, Madras-600033 were granted a Licence No. P/Z/1935974/C|XX|82|M|81 dated 2-3-82 for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000.

As there was a reason to believe that the above import licence has been obtained by producing a Chartered Accountant Certificate certifying their past imports which was not genuine a Show cause Notice was issued calling upon the Licence Holder to show cause why action should not be taken to cancel the licence giving an opportunity for a Personal Hearing on 16-11-82. As the party did not turn up for a Personal hearing to explain his case, I am satisfied that the above Import Licence has been obtained by fraudulent means and hereby decide to cancel the licence ex-parte.

I, in exercise of the Powers vested on me in terms of Clause 9(1)(a) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955, hereby cancel the Import Licence No. P/Z/1935974/C|XX|82/81 dated 2-3-82 issued to M/s. Anand Provisions, 11 Jubilee Road, West Mambalam, Madras-600033 for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000 for April—March 1982 period.

[No. DF/1072/AM. 82/AU. III]

का०आ० 761:—सर्वश्री अलंकार एन्टरप्राइजस, 16, शा वालास कालनी, आदम्बाक्कम, मद्रास को रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी जेड-1936235-सी-एक्सएक्स-82-एम-81 दिनांक 24-2-82 जारी किया गया था।

उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस सनदी लेखापाल द्वारा भूतपूर्व आयात के प्रमाणपत्र जारी करने के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है। उस प्रमाणपत्र के अवास्तविकता के बारे में विश्वास करने का कारण दिखाई देने से, पार्टी से यह पूछते हुए एक कारण बताओ नोटिस जारी किया गया था कि 30-11-1982 को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई का अवसर देने के पश्चात उनको जारी किया गया लाइसेंस क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाए। अपने मामले को स्पष्ट करने व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए पार्टी के न आने के कारण, मैं इस बात से संतुष्ट हूँ कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस गलत सनदी लेखापाल प्रमाणपत्र के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है और एतद्द्वारा लाइसेंस को रद्द करने की एक-पक्षीय निर्णय लेता हूँ।

मैं, आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश 1955 की धारा 9(1) (ए) के अन्तर्गत प्रवृत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सर्वश्री अलंकार एन्टरप्राइजस, 16, शा वालास कालनी, आदम्बाक्कम, मद्रास को अप्रैल-मार्च 1982 की अवधि के लिए रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए जारी किये गये लाइसेंस संख्या पी जेड-1936235-सी-एक्सएक्स-82-एम-81 दिनांक 29-3-82 को एतद्द्वारा रद्द करता हूँ।

[सं० डीएफ/1186/एम 82/एयू 3]

S.O. 761.—M/s. Alankar Enterprises, 16, Show Wallace Colony, Adambakam, Madras were granted a Licence No. P/Z/1936235/C|XX|82/M|81 dated 29-3-82 for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000.

As there was a reason to believe that the above import licence has been obtained by producing a Chartered Accountant Certificate certifying their past imports which was not genuine, a Show cause Notice was issued calling upon the Licence Holder to show cause why action should not be taken to cancel the licence giving an opportunity for a Personal Hearing on 16-11-82. As the party did not turn up for a Personal Hearing to explain his case, I am satisfied that the above Import Licence has been obtained by fraudulent means and hereby decide to cancel the licence ex-parte.

I, in exercise of the powers vested on me in terms of Clause 9(1)(a) of the Imports (Control) Orders, 1955, hereby cancel the Import Licence No. P/Z/1936235/C/XX/82/M/81 dated 29-3-82 issued to M/s. Alankar Enterprises, 16, Shaw Wallace Colony, Adambakkam, Madras, for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000 for April—March 1982 period.

[No. DF/1186/AM. 82/AU. III]

कां.प्रा. 762:—सर्वश्री जेमिनी एन्टरप्राइजस, 76, टी.के. मुदली स्ट्रीट, मद्रास-600007 को रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी/जे/ड 1936045/सी/एक्स एक्स/82/एम-81 दिनांक 4-3-82 जारी किया गया था।

उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस सनदी लेखापाल द्वारा भूतपूर्व आयात के प्रमाणपत्र जारी करने के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है। उस प्रमाणपत्र के अवास्तविकता के बारे में विश्वास करने का कारण दिखाई देने से, पार्टी से यह पूछते हुए एक कारण बताओ नोटिस जारी किया गया था कि 30 नवम्बर, 1982 को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई का अवसर देने के पश्चात उनको जारी किया गया लाइसेंस क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाए। अपने मामले को स्पष्ट करने, व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए पार्टी न आने के कारण, मैं इस बात से संतुष्ट हूँ कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस गलत सनदी लेखापाल प्रमाणपत्र के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है और एतद् द्वारा लाइसेंस को रद्द करने का एक-पक्षीय निर्णय लेता हूँ।

मैं, आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश 1955 की धारा 9(1) (ए) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सर्वश्री जेमिनी एन्टरप्राइजस, 76, टी.के. मुदली स्ट्रीट, मद्रास-600007 को, अप्रैल-मार्च, 1982 की अवधि के लिए रु. 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए जारी किये गये लाइसेंस संख्या पी/जड/1936545/सी/एक्सएक्स/82 एम/81 दिनांक 4-3-1982 को एतद् द्वारा रद्द करता हूँ।

[सं.डी एफ/1171ए०एम०-82/ए०यू०-III]

S.O. 762.—M/s. Gemini Enterprises, 76, T. K. Mudali St, Madras-600007 were granted a Licence No. P/Z/1936045/C/XX/82/M/81 dated 4-3-82 for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000.

As there was a reason to believe that the above import licence has been obtained by producing a Chartered Accountant Certificate certifying their past imports which was not genuine, a Show cause Notice was issued calling upon the Licence Holder to show cause why action should not be taken to cancel the licence giving an opportunity for a Personal Hearing on 30-11-82. As the party did not turn up for a Personal Hearing to explain his case, I am satisfied that the above Import Licence has been obtained by fraudulent means and hereby decide to cancel the licence ex-parte.

I, in exercise of the powers vested on me in terms of Clause 9(1)(a) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955 hereby

cancel the Import licence No. P/Z/1936045/C/XX/82/M/81 dated 4-3-82 issued to M/s. Gemini Enterprises, 76, T. K. Mudali St, Madras-600007 for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000 for April—March 1982 period.

[No. DF/1171/AM. 82/AU. III]

कां.प्रा. 763:—सर्वश्री इलेट प्रोविजन्स, 70, पेडरियार कोइल स्ट्रीट, मद्रास-600001 को रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी/जड/1936107/सी/एक्सएक्स/82/एम/81 दिनांक 6-3-82 जारी किया गया था।

उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस सनदी लेखापाल द्वारा भूतपूर्व आयात के प्रमाणपत्र जारी करने के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है। उस प्रमाणपत्र के अवास्तविकता के बारे में विश्वास करने का कारण दिखाई देने से, पार्टी से यह पूछते हुए एक कारण बताओ नोटिस जारी किया गया था कि 30-11-82 को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई का अवसर देने के पश्चात उनको जारी किया गया लाइसेंस क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाए। अपने मामले को स्पष्ट करने व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए पार्टी न आने के कारण, मैं इस बात से संतुष्ट हूँ कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस गलत सनदी लेखापाल प्रमाणपत्र के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है और एतद् द्वारा लाइसेंस को रद्द करने का एक-पक्षीय निर्णय लेता हूँ।

मैं, आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश 1955 की धारा 9(1) (ए) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सर्वश्री इलेट प्रोविजन्स, 70, पेडरियार कोइल स्ट्रीट, मद्रास 600001 को, अप्रैल-मार्च 1982 की अवधि के लिए रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए जारी किये गये लाइसेंस संख्या पी/जड/1936107/सी/एक्सएक्स/82/एम/81 दिनांक 6-3-82 को एतद् द्वारा रद्द करता हूँ।

[संख्या डी एफ/1250/ए एम/82/एयू 3]

S.O. 763.—M/s. Elite Provisions, 70-Pedariar Koil Street, Madras-1 were granted a licence No. P/Z/1936107/C/XX/82/M/81 dt. 6-3-82 for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000.

As there was a reason to believe that the above import licence has been obtained by producing a Chartered Accountant Certificate certifying their past imports which was not genuine, a Show cause Notice was issued calling upon the Licence Holder to show cause why action should not be taken to cancel the licence giving an opportunity for a Personal Hearing on 30-11-82. As the party did not turn up for a Personal Hearing to explain his case, I am satisfied that the above Import Licence has been obtained by fraudulent means and hereby decide to cancel the licence ex parte.

I, in exercise of the powers vested on me in terms of Clause 9(1)(a) of the Imports (Control) Orders, 1955, hereby cancel the Import Licence No. P/Z/1936107/C/XX/82/M/81 dated 6-3-82 issued to M/s. Elite Provisions, 70 Pedariar Koil Street, Madras-600001 for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000 for April—March 1982 period.

[F. No. DF/1250/AM. 82/AU. III]

कां.प्रा. 764:—सर्वश्री कुलदीप स्टोर्स, 262/1, नेहरू टिम्बर मार्केट, मद्रास-112 को रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए आयात लाइसेंस संख्या

पी/जैड/1936116/सी/एक्स-एक्स/82/एम/81 दिनांक 6-3-82 जारी किया गया था।

उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस सनदी लेखापाल द्वारा भूतपूर्व आयात के प्रमाणपत्र जारी करने के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है, उस प्रमाणपत्र के अवास्तविकता के बारे में विश्वास करने का कारण दिखाई देने से, पार्टी से यह पूछते हुए एक कारण बताओ नोटिस जारी किया गया था कि 30-11-1982 को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई का अवसर देने के पश्चात उनको जारी किया गया लाइसेंस क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाए। अपने मामले को स्पष्ट करने, व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए पार्टी न आने के कारण, मैं इस बात से संतुष्ट हूँ कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस गलत सनदी लेखापाल प्रमाणपत्र के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है और एतद्वारा लाइसेंस को रद्द करने का एक-पक्षीय निर्णय लेता हूँ।

मैं, आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश 1955 की धारा 9(1) (ए) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सर्वश्री कुलदीप स्टोर्स, 262/1, नेहरू टिम्बर मार्केट, मद्रास-600112 को, अप्रैल—मार्च 1982 की अवधि के लिए रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए जारी किये गये लाइसेंस संख्या पी/जैड/1936116/सी/एक्स एक्स-82/एम/81 दिनांक 6-3-82 को एतद्वारा रद्द करता हूँ।

[संख्या डी एफ/1242/ए एम 82/एयू 3]

S.O. 764.—M/s. Kuldeep Stores, 262/1 Nehru Timber, Market Madras-112 were granted a Licence No. P/Z/1936116/C/XX/82/M/81 dated 6-3-82 for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000.

As there was a reason to believe that the above Import licence has been obtained by producing a Chartered Accountant Certificate certifying their past imports which was not genuine, a Show cause Notice was issued calling upon the Licence Holder to show cause why action should not be taken to cancel the licence giving an opportunity for a Personal Hearing on 30-11-82. As the party did not turn up for a Personal Hearing to explain his case, I am satisfied that the above Import Licence has been obtained by fraudulent means and hereby decide to cancel the licence ex-parte.

I, in exercise of the powers vested on me in terms of clause 9(1)(a) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955, hereby cancel the Import Licence No. P/Z/1936116/C/XX/82/M/81 dated 6-3-82 issued to M/s. Kuldeep Stores, 262/1, Nehru Timber Market, Madras-600112 for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000 for April—March 1982 Period.

[No. DF/1242/AM. 82/AU. III]

का०प्रा० 765.—सर्वश्री ट्रिनिटी ट्रेडर्स, 11, ऐयप्पन नगर, माडीप्पाक्कम, मद्रास को रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी/जैड/1936227/सी/एक्स एक्स/82/एम/81 दिनांक 25-3-82 जारी किया गया था।

उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस सनदी लेखापाल द्वारा भूतपूर्व आयात के प्रमाणपत्र जारी करने के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है। उस प्रमाणपत्र के अवास्तविकता के बारे में विश्वास करने का कारण दिखाई देने से, पार्टी से यह पूछते हुए एक कारण बताओ नोटिस जारी किया गया था कि 30-11-82 को

व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई का अवसर देने के पश्चात उनको जारी किया गया लाइसेंस क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाए। अपने मामले को स्पष्ट करने, व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए पार्टी न आने के कारण, मैं इस बात से संतुष्ट हूँ कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस गलत सनदी लेखापाल प्रमाणपत्र के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है और एतद्वारा लाइसेंस को रद्द करने का एक-पक्षीय निर्णय लेता हूँ।

मैं, आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश 1955 की धारा 9(1) (ए) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सर्वश्री ट्रिनिटी ट्रेडर्स, 11, ऐयप्पन नगर, माडीप्पाक्कम, मद्रास-1 को, अप्रैल—मार्च 1982 की अवधि के लिये रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए जारी किये गये लाइसेंस संख्या पी/जैड/1936227/सी/एक्स एक्स/82 एम/81 दिनांक 233382 को एतद्वारा रद्द करता हूँ।

[संख्या डी एफ/1185/ए एम 82/एयू 3]

S.O. 765.—M/s. Trinity Traders, 11, Oyyappan Nagar, Madippakkam, Madras were granted a Licence No. P/Z/1936227/C/XX/82/M/81 dated 25-3-82 for import of dry fruits for Rs. 10,000.

As there was a reason to believe that the above import licence has been obtained by producing a Chartered Accountant Certificate certifying their past imports which was not genuine, a Show cause Notice was issued calling upon the Licence Holder to show cause why action should not be taken to cancel the licence giving an opportunity for a Personal Hearing on explain 30-11-82. As the party did not turn up for a Personal Hearing to explain his case, I am satisfied that the above Import Licence has been obtained by fraudulent means and hereby decide to cancel the licence ex-parte.

I, in exercise of the powers vested on me in terms of Clause 9(1)(a) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955, hereby cancel the Import Licence No. P/Z/1936227/C/XX/82/M/81 dated 25-3-82 issued to M/s. Trinity Traders 11, Oyyappan Nagar, Madippakkam, Madras-1 for import of dry fruits for Rs. 10,000 for April—March 1982 Period.

[No. DF/1185/AM-82/AU-III]

का०प्रा० 766.—सर्वश्री वेंलाकली ब्रदर्स, 4, महात्मा गांधी रोड, दूसरी अविन्यू, मद्रास-600041 को रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी/जैड-1936105/सी/एक्स एक्स/82/एम/81 दिनांक 6-3-82 जारी किया गया था।

उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस सनदी लेखापाल द्वारा भूतपूर्व आयात के प्रमाणपत्र जारी करने के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है। उस प्रमाणपत्र के अवास्तविकता के बारे में विश्वास करने का कारण दिखाई देने से, पार्टी से यह पूछते हुए एक कारण बताओ नोटिस जारी किया गया था कि 30-11-82 को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई का अवसर देने के पश्चात उनको जारी किया गया लाइसेंस क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाए। अपने मामले को स्पष्ट करने, व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए पार्टी न आने के कारण, मैं इस बात से संतुष्ट हूँ कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस गलत सनदी लेखापाल प्रमाणपत्र के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है और एतद्वारा लाइसेंस का रद्द करने का एक-पक्षीय निर्णय लेता हूँ।

मैं, आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश 1955 की धारा 9(1) (ए) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सर्वश्री वेलांकनी ब्रदर्स, 4-बी, महात्मा गांधी रोड, दूसरी भविष्य, मद्रास-600041 को, अप्रैल—मार्च 1982 की अवधि के लिए रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए जारी किये गये लाइसेंस संख्या पी/जेड/1936105-सी/एक्सएक्स/81/एम/81 दिनांक 6-3-82 को एतद्वारा रद्द करता हूँ।

[संख्या डी एफ/1251/एएम 82/एयू 3]

S.O. 766.—M/s. Velankanni Bros. 4, B-Mahatma Gandhi Road, II Avenue Madras-600041 were granted a Licence No. P/Z/1936105/C/XX/82/M/81 dated 6-3-82 for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000.

As there was a reason to believe that the above import licence has been obtained by producing a Chartered Accountant Certificate certifying their past imports which was not genuine, a Show cause Notice was issued calling upon the Licence Holder to show cause why action should not be taken to cancel the licence giving an opportunity for a Personal Hearing on 30-11-82. As the party did not turn up for a Personal Hearing to explain his case, I am satisfied that the above Import Licence has been obtained by fraudulent means and hereby decide to cancel the licence ex-parte.

1, in exercise of the powers vested on me in terms of Clause 9(1)(a) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955, hereby cancel the Import Licence No. P/Z/1936105/C/XX/82/M/81 dated 6-3-82 issued to M/s. Velankanni Bros., 4-B. Mahatma Gandhi Road, 11 Avenue, Madras-600041 for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000 for April—March, 1982 period.

[No. DF/1251/AM-82/AU III]

का० आ० 767.—सर्वश्री महावीरा ट्रेडर्स, 14, तोलसिंगम स्ट्रीट, मद्रास-600001 को रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी/जेड/1936173/सी/एक्सएक्स/82/एम/81 दिनांक 19-3-82 जारी किया गया था।

उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस सनदी लेखापाल द्वारा भूतपूर्व आयात के प्रमाणपत्र जारी करने के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है। उस प्रमाणपत्र के अवास्तविकता के बारे में विश्वास करने का कारण दिखाई देने से, पार्टी, मे यह पूछते हुए एक कारण बताओ नोटिस जारी किया गया था कि 30-11-82 को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई का अवसर देने के पश्चात उनको जारी किया गया लाइसेंस क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाए। अपने मामले को स्पष्ट करने, व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए पार्टी न आने के कारण, मैं इस बात से संतुष्ट हूँ कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस गलत सनदी लेखापाल प्रमाणपत्र के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है और एतद्वारा लाइसेंस को रद्द करने का एक-पक्षीय निर्णय लेता हूँ।

मैं, आयात नियंत्रण आदेश 1955 की धारा 9(1)ए के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सर्वश्री महावीरा ट्रेडर्स, 14, तोलसिंगम स्ट्रीट, मद्रास-1 को अप्रैल—मार्च 1982 की अवधि के लिए रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए जारी किये गये लाइसेंस संख्या 1232 GU/82—2.

पी/जेड/1936173/सी/एक्सएक्स/82/एम/81 दिनांक 19-3-82 को एतद्वारा रद्द करता हूँ।

[संख्या : डीएफ-1206-एएम/82-एयू 3]

S.O. 767.—M/s. Mahavira Trades, 14 Tholasingam Street, Madras-600001 were granted a Licence No. P/Z/1936173/C/XX/82/M/81 dt. 19-3-82 for Import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000.

As there was a reason to believe that the above import licence has been obtained by producing a Chartered Accountant Certificate certifying their past imports which was not genuine, a Show cause Notice was issued calling upon the Licence Holder to show cause why action should not be taken to cancel the licence giving an opportunity for a Personal Hearing on 30-11-82. As the party did not turn up for a Personal Hearing to explain his case, I am satisfied that the above Import Licence has been obtained by fraudulent means and hereby decide to cancel the licence ex-parte.

I, in exercise of the powers vested on me in terms of Clause 9(1)(a) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955, hereby cancel the Import licence No. P/Z/1936173/C/XX/82/M/81 dt. 19-3-82, issued to M/s. Mahavira Traders 14 Tholasingam street, Madras-1, for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000 for April—March 1982 period.

[No. DF/1206/AM-82/AU III]

का० आ० 768.—सर्वश्री गणपति प्रोविजन्स, 39, साट्टननाइक्कन स्ट्रीट, मद्रास-7 को रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए लाइसेंस संख्या पी/जेड/1936043-सी/एक्सएक्स/82/एम/81 दिनांक 4-3-82 जारी किया गया था।

उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस सनदी लेखापाल द्वारा भूतपूर्व आयात के प्रमाणपत्र जारी करने के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है। उस प्रमाणपत्र के अवास्तविकता के बारे में विश्वास करने का कारण दिखाई देने से, पार्टी से यह पूछते हुए एक कारण बताओ नोटिस जारी किया गया था कि 30-11-82 को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई का अवसर देने के पश्चात उनको जारी किया गया लाइसेंस क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाए। अपने मामले को स्पष्ट करने, व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए पार्टी न आने के कारण, मैं इस बात से संतुष्ट हूँ कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस गलत सनदी लेखापाल प्रमाणपत्र के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है और एतद्वारा लाइसेंस को रद्द करने का एक-पक्षीय निर्णय लेता हूँ।

मैं, आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश 1955 की धारा 9(1)(ए) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सर्वश्री गणपति प्रोविजन्स, 39, साट्टननाइक्कन स्ट्रीट, मद्रास-600007 को, अप्रैल—मार्च 1982 की अवधि के लिए रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए जारी किये गये लाइसेंस संख्या पी/जेड/1936043/सी/एक्सएक्स/82/एम/81 दिनांक 4-3-82 को एतद्वारा रद्द करता हूँ।

[संख्या : डीएफ/1167/एएम 82/एयू 3]

S.O. 768.—M/s. Ganapathy Provisions, 39, Sattanna Naicken street, Madras-7, were granted a licence No. P/Z/1936043/C/XX/82/M/81 dt. 4-3-82 for import of Dry fruits for Rs. 10,000.

As there was a reason to believe that the above import licence has been obtained by producing a Chartered Accountant Certificate certifying their past imports which was not genuine, a Show Cause Notice was issued calling upon the Licence Holder to show cause why action should not be taken to cancel the licence giving an opportunity for a Personal Hearing on 30-11-82. As the party did not turn up for a Personal Hearing to explain his case, I am satisfied that the above Import Licence has been obtained by fraudulent means and hereby decide to cancel the licence ex-parte.

I, in exercise of the powers vested on me in terms of Clause 9(1)(a) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955, hereby cancel the Import Licence No. P/Z/1936043/C/XXI/82/M/81 dt. 4-3-82 issued to M/s Ganapathy Provisions, 39, Sattanna Naicken Street, Madras-600007 for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000 for April—March 82 period.

[No. DF/1167/AM-82/AU III]

का० प्रा० 769.—सर्वश्री मुकुन्त ट्रेडर्स, 1/4, एल० वी० रोड, डाक्टर एम० एल० आर० रोड, मद्रास-600 041 को रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी-इजिट-1936090-सी-एक्सएक्स-82-एम-81 दिनांक 6-3-82 जारी किया गया था।

उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस सनदी लेखापाल द्वारा भूतपूर्व आयात के प्रमाणपत्र जारी करने के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है। उस प्रमाणपत्र के अवास्तविकता के बारे में विश्वास करने का कारण दिखाई देने से, पार्टी से यह पूछते हुए एक कारण बताओ नोटिस जारी किया गया था कि 30-11-82 को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई का अवसर देने के पश्चात् उनको जारी किया गया लाइसेंस क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाए। अपने मामले को स्पष्ट करने, व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए पार्टी न आने के कारण, मैं उस बात से संतुष्ट हूँ कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस गलत सनदी लेखापाल प्रमाणपत्र के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है और एतद्द्वारा लाइसेंस को रद्द करने की एक-पक्षीय निर्णय लेता हूँ।

मैं आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश 1955 की धारा 9(1)ए के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए सर्वश्री मुकुन्त ट्रेडर्स, 1/4, एल० वी० रोड, डाक्टर एम० एल० आर० रोड, मद्रास-600 041 को अप्रैल-मार्च 1982 की अवधि के लिए रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए जारी किये गये लाइसेंस संख्या पी-इजिट-1936090-सी-एक्सएक्स-82-एम-81 दिनांक 6-3-82 को एतद्द्वारा रद्द करता हूँ।

[संख्या : डीएफ-1256-एम-82-एयू 3]

S.O. 769.—M/s. Mukunth Traders, 1/4, L. B. Road, Dr. M. L. R. Road, Madras-600041, were granted a Licence No. P/Z/1936090/C/XXI/82/M/81 dated 6-3-82 for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000.

As there was a reason to believe that the above import licence has been obtained by producing a Chartered Accountant Certificate certifying their past imports which was not genuine a Show Cause Notice was issued calling upon the Licence Holder to show cause why action should not be taken to cancel the licence giving an opportunity for a Personal Hearing on 30-11-82. As the party did not turn up for a Personal Hearing to explain his case, I am satisfied that the above Import Licence has been obtained by fraudulent means and hereby decide to cancel the licence ex-parte.

I, in exercise of the powers vested on me in terms of Clause 9(1)(a) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955, hereby cancel the Import Licence No. P/Z/1936090/C/XXI/82/M/81 dt. 6-3-82 issued to M/s. Mukuntha Traders, 1/4, L. B. Road, Dr. M. L. R. Road, Madras-600041 for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000 for April—March 1982 period.

[F. No. DF/1256/AM-82/AU III]

का० प्रा० 770.—सर्वश्री कैलासम स्टोर्स, संख्या-63, नारायण मुदली स्ट्रीट, मद्रास-600 001 को रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी-इजिट-1935807-सी-एक्सएक्स-82-एम-81 दिनांक 5-2-82 जारी किया गया था।

उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस सनदी लेखापाल द्वारा भूतपूर्व आयात के प्रमाणपत्र जारी करने के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है। उस प्रमाणपत्र के अवास्तविकता के बारे में विश्वास करने का कारण दिखाई देने से, पार्टी से यह पूछते हुए एक कारण बताओ नोटिस जारी किया गया था कि 16-11-82 को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई का अवसर देने के पश्चात् उनको जारी किया गया लाइसेंस क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाए। अपने मामले को स्पष्ट करने, व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए पार्टी न आने के कारण, मैं इस बात से संतुष्ट हूँ कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस गलत सनदी लेखापाल प्रमाणपत्र के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है और एतद्द्वारा लाइसेंस को रद्द करने की एक-पक्षीय निर्णय लेता हूँ।

मैं आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश 1955 की धारा 9(1)ए के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सर्वश्री कैलासम स्टोर्स संख्या-63, नारायण मुदली स्ट्रीट-मद्रास 600 001 को, अप्रैल-मार्च 1982 की अवधि के लिए रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए जारी किये गये लाइसेंस संख्या पी-इजिट-1935807-सी-एक्सएक्स-82-एम-81 दिनांक 5-2-82 को एतद्द्वारा रद्द करता हूँ।

[संख्या : डीएफ-804-एम-82-एयू 3]

S.O. 770.—M/s. Kailasam Stores, No. 63 Narayana Mudali St., Madras-600001 were granted a Licence No. P/Z/1935807/C/XXI/82/M/81 dated 5-2-82 for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000.

As there was a reason to believe that the above import licence has been obtained by producing a Chartered Accountant Certificate certifying their past imports which was not genuine a Show Cause Notice was issued calling upon the Licence Holder to show cause why action should not be taken to cancel the licence giving an opportunity for a Personal Hearing on 16-11-82. As the party did not turn up for a Personal Hearing to explain his case, I am satisfied that the above Import Licence has been obtained by fraudulent means and hereby decide to cancel the licence ex parte.

I, in exercise of the Powers vested on me in terms of Clause 9(1)(a) of the Imports (Control) Orders, 1955, hereby cancel the Import Licence No. P/Z/1935807/C/XXI/82/M/81 dated 5-2-82 issued to M/s. Kailasam Stores, No. 63 Narayana Mudali St., Madras 600001 for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000 for April—March 1982 period.

[No. DF/804/AM-82/AU III]

का० प्रा० 771.—सर्वश्री कमलम्बाल स्टोर्स, 10, रामस्वामी पिल्लै स्ट्रीट, पुरसवाक्कम, मद्रास-600 084 को रुपये

10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी-इजट-1936089-सी-एक्सएक्स-82-एम-81 दिनांक 6-3-82 जारी किया गया था।

उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस सनदी लेखापाल द्वारा भूतपूर्व आयात के प्रमाणपत्र जारी करने के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है। उम प्रमाणपत्र के आधार विक्ता के बारे में विश्वास करने का कारण दिखाई देने से, पार्टी से यह पृष्ठों हुए एक कारण बनाया नोटिस जारी किया गया था कि 30-11-82 को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई का अवसर देने के पश्चात् उनको जारी किया गया लाइसेंस क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाए। अपने मामले को स्पष्ट करने व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए पार्टी न आने के कारण, मैं इस बात से संतुष्ट हूँ कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस गलत सनदी लेखापाल प्रमाणपत्र के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है और एतद्वारा लाइसेंस को रद्द करने की एक-पक्षीय निर्णय लेता हूँ।

मैं, आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश 1955 की धारा 9(1) (ए) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सर्वश्री कमलम्बाल स्टोर्स, 10, रामस्वामी पिल्लै स्ट्रीट, पुरसवाक्कम, मद्रास-600 084 को, अप्रैल-मार्च 1982 की अवधि के लिए रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए जारी किये गये लाइसेंस संख्या पी-इजट-1936089-सी-एक्सएक्स-82-एम-81 दिनांक 6-3-82 को एतद्वारा रद्द करता हूँ।

[संख्या डीएफ-1258/एम-82/एमू 3]

S.O. 771.—M/s. Kamalambal Stores, 10, Ramaswami Pillai St., Purasawalkam, Madras-600084 were granted a Licence No. P/Z/1936089/C/XX/82/M/81 dated 6-3-82 for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000.

As there was a reason to believe that the above import licence has been obtained by producing a Chartered Accountant Certificate certifying their past imports which was not genuine, a Show Cause Notice was issued calling upon the Licence Holder to show cause why action should not be taken to cancel the licence giving an opportunity for a Personal Hearing on 30-11-82. As the party did not turn up for a Personal Hearing to explain his case, I am satisfied that the above Import Licence has been obtained by fraudulent means and hereby decide to cancel the licence ex-parte.

I, in exercise of the powers vested on me in terms of Clause 9(1)(a) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955, hereby cancel the import licence No. P/Z/1936089/C/XX/82/M/81 dated 6-3-82 issued to M/s. Kamalambal Stores, 10, Ramaswami Pillai St., Purasawalkam Madras-600084 for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000 for April—March 1982 Period.

[No. DF/1258/AM-82/AU III]

मद्रास, 28 दिसम्बर, 1982

का० आ० 772.—सर्वश्री कैरला मसाला प्राइवेट्स., 235, टेप्पम ईस्ट बाजार, विरुधुनगर-626001 को रुपये 15,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी-इजट-1936592-सी-एक्सएक्स-85-एम-82 दिनांक 15-10-82 जारी किया गया था।

1982-83 की आयात-निर्यात क्रियाविधि पुस्तिका के पैरा 353 में अपेक्षित शपथ-पत्र दाखिल करते हुए आधेदक ने कहा है कि लाइसेंस संख्या पी-इजट-1936592 दिनांक 15-10-82 की सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजनार्थ प्रति तथा मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति दोनों किसी भी सीमाशुल्क प्राधिकारी से पंजीकृत किये बिना या तो उपयोग किये बिना खो दी गयी है/अस्थानस्थ हो गई है।

मैं, इस बात से संतुष्ट हूँ कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजनार्थ प्रति तथा मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति दोनों अस्थानस्थ हो गयी है।

यथासंशोधित आयात व्यापार नियंत्रण आदेश 1955 दिनांक 7-12-55 की धारा 9(सीमी) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों के द्वारा रुपये 15,000 का लाइसेंस संख्या पी-इजट-1936592 दिनांक 15-10-82 की सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजनार्थ मूल प्रति तथा मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण मूल प्रति दोनों रद्द किये जाते हैं।

[संख्या डीएफ-268/एम-83/एमू 3]

Madras, the 28th December, 1982

S.O. 772.—M/s. Kerala Masala Products, 235, Teppam East Bazar, Virudhunagar-626001 were granted import licence No. P/Z/1936592/C/XX/85/M/82 dt. 15-10-82 for Rs. 15,000 for import of Dry Fruits.

The Applicant has filed an affidavit as required under para 353 of Hand Book of Import—Export Procedures 1982-83 wherein they have stated that both Customs Copy and Exchange Control copy of the licence No. P/Z/1936592 dt. 12-10-82 for Rs. 15,000 issued for the period AM. 83 has been lost/misplaced without having been registered with any Customs Authority and utilised at all.

I am satisfied that the both Customs Purpose Copy and Exchange Control Copy of the licence has been misplaced.

In exercise of the powers conferred on me under subject clause 9(cc) in the Import Trade Control Order 1955 dated 7-12-55 as amended upto date the said both original Customs Purpose Copy and Exchange Control copy of the licence No. P/Z/1936592 dated 15-10-82 for the value of Rs. 15,000 are hereby canceled.

[No. DF/268/AM-83/AU III]

मद्रास, 2 सितम्बर, 1982

का० आ० 773.—सर्वश्री बेंकी जेनरल स्टोर्स 70 पेंडरियार कोइल स्ट्रीट मद्रास-600 001 को रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी-इजट-1935916 सी-एक्सएक्स-82-एम-81 दिनांक 25-2-82 जारी किया गया था।

उपयुक्त लाइसेंस सनदी लेखापाल द्वारा भूतपूर्व आयात के प्रमाणपत्र जारी करने के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है। उस प्रमाणपत्र के अवास्तविकता के बारे में विश्वास करने का कारण दिखाई देने में पार्टी से यह पूछते हुए एक कारण बताओ नोटिस जारी किया गया था कि 22-7-1982 को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई का अवसर देने के पश्चात् उनको जारी किया गया लाइसेंस क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाए। अपने मामले को स्पष्ट करने व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए पार्टी ने उनके कारणों में इस बात से संतुष्ट हैं कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस गलत सनदी लेखापाल प्रमाणपत्र के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है और एतद् द्वारा लाइसेंस को रद्द करने की एक पक्षीय निर्णय लेता हूँ।

मैं आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश 1955 की धारा 9 (1) (ए) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सर्वश्री डी० जी० प्राविजन्स, 134/1, सेडनाम् रोड, मद्रास 600112 को, अप्रैल-मार्च 1982 की अवधि के लिए रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए जारी किये गये लाइसेंस संख्या पी० इजट-1936115 सी-एक्स-एस 82-एम 32 दिनांक 6-3-82 का एतद् द्वारा रद्द करता हूँ।

[सं. डी. एफ-954-ए. एम-82 एयू-3]

Madras, the 2nd September, 1982

S.O. 773.—M/s. Venky General Stores, 70 Peddalar Koli Street Madras-600001 were granted a Licence No. P/Z/1935916/C/XX/M/81 dated 25-2-82 for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000.

As there was a reason to believe that the above import licence has been obtained by producing a Chartered Accountant Certificate certifying their past imports which was not genuine a Show Cause Notice was issued calling upon the Licence Holder to show cause why action should not be taken to cancel the licence giving an opportunity for a Personal Hearing on 22-7-82. As the party did not turn up for a Personal Hearing to explain his case, I am satisfied that the above Import Licence has been obtained by fraudulent means and hereby decide to cancel the licence ex-parte.

I, in exercise of the powers vested on me in terms of Clause 9(1)(a) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955, hereby cancel the Import Licence No. P/Z/1935916/C/XX/82/81 dated 25-2-82 issued to M/s. Venky General Stores, 70 Peddalar Koli Street, Madras-600001 for import of Dry Fruits for Rs. 10,000 for April—March 1982 period.

[No. DF/954/AM-82/AU III]

मद्रास, 16 सितम्बर 1982

का० आ० 774.—सर्वश्री डी. डी. प्राविजन्स 134/1, सेडनाम् रोड, मद्रास-600112 को रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों को आयात करने के लिए आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी०-इजट-1936115-सी-एक्स-एस-82 एम-81 दिनांक 6-8-82 को जारी किया गया था।

उपयुक्त लाइसेंस सनदी लेखापाल द्वारा भूतपूर्व आयात के प्रमाणपत्र जारी करने के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है। उस प्रमाणपत्र के अवास्तविकता के बारे में विश्वास करने का कारण दिखाई देने से, पार्टी से यह पूछते हुए एक कारण बताओ नोटिस जारी किया गया था कि 30-8-82 को व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई का अवसर देने के पश्चात् उनको जारी किया गया लाइसेंस क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाए। अपने मामले को स्पष्ट करने व्यक्तिगत सुनवाई के लिए पार्टी ने आने के कारण, मैं इस बात से संतुष्ट हूँ कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस गलत सनदी लेखापाल प्रमाणपत्र के आधार पर प्राप्त किया गया है और एतद् द्वारा लाइसेंस को रद्द करने की एक-पक्षीय निर्णय लेता हूँ।

मैं, आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश 1955 की धारा 9(1)

(ए) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सर्वश्री डी० जी० प्राविजन्स, 134/1, सेडनाम् रोड, मद्रास 600112 को, अप्रैल-मार्च 1982 की अवधि के लिए रुपये 10,000 तक सूखे फलों का आयात करने के लिए जारी किये गये लाइसेंस संख्या पी० इजट-1936115 सी-एक्स-एस 82-एम 32 दिनांक 6-3-82 का एतद् द्वारा रद्द करता हूँ।

[संख्या डी० एफ० 1243-एस० एम० 82-एयू-3]

सी.जी. फेरनान्डेस उप मुख्य नियंत्रक आयात तथा निर्यात

Madras, the 16th September, 1982

S.O. 774.—M/s. D. D. Provisions 134/1 Sydenhams Road Madras-600112 were granted a licence No. P/Z/1936115/C/XX/82/M/81 dt. 6-3-82 for import of dry fruits for Rs. 10,000.

As there was a reason to believe that the above import licence has been obtained by producing a Chartered Accountant Certificate certifying their past imports which was not genuine a Show Cause Notice was issued calling upon the Licence Holder to show cause why action should not be taken to cancel the licence giving an opportunity for a Personal Hearing on 30-2-82. As the party did not turn up for a Personal Hearing to explain his case, I am satisfied that the above Import Licence has been obtained by fraudulent means and hereby decide to cancel the licence ex-parte.

I, in exercise of the powers vested on me in terms of clause 9(1)(a) of the imports (control) order 1955 hereby cancel the import licence No. P/Z/1936115/C/XX/82/M/81 dt. 6-3-82 issued to M/s. D. D. Provisions 134/1 Sydenhams Road Madras-600112 for import of dry fruits for Rs. 10,000 for April—March 1982 period.

[No. DF/1243/AM-82/AU III]
C. G. FERNANDEZ, Dy. Chief Controller,
Imports and Exports

मागीरिक पूर्ति मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 14 जनवरी 1983

का० आ० 775.—डा० एम० के० मिश्र, अपर कानूनी सलाहकार विधि मंत्रालय, शाखा सचिवालय, बम्बई ने 24 दिसम्बर, 1982 के अपराह्न से वायवा बाजार आयोग, बम्बई के सदस्य का कार्यभार छोड़ दिया है।

2. अधिम संवेदा (नियमन) अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 74) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (ii) द्वारा प्रति शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार इनके द्वारा श्री ए० एन० कोल्हटकर, भारतीय राजस्व सेवा (आई टी०) को 30 दिसम्बर, 1982 के अपराह्न से प्रायः और आदेश होने तक वायवा बाजार आयोग, बम्बई में सदस्य के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[मिंसि संख्या ए-12011/17/82-प्रशा०-2]

उ० र० कुर्जेकर, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF CIVIL SUPPLY

New Delhi, the 14th January, 1983

S.O. 775.—Dr. M. K. Misra, Additional Legal Adviser, Ministry of Law, Branch Secretariat, Bombay, delinquished charge of the post of Member Forward Markets Commission, Bombay, in the afternoon of the 24th December, 1982.

2. In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-Section (II) of Section 3 of the Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1952 (74 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri A. N. Kolhatkar, IRS (IT), as a Member of the Forward Markets Commission, Bombay, with effect from the afternoon of the 30th December, 1982 until further orders.

[File No. A-12011/17/82-Estt. II]
U. R. KURLEKAR, Dy. Secy.

ऊर्जा मंत्रालय

(विद्युत विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 15 जनवरी, 1983

कां०मा० 776—सरकारी स्थान (अप्रतिष्ठित अधिकारियों की बेवकाली) अधिनियम 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा 3 के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद् द्वारा नीचे की तालिका के कालम (2) में उल्लिखित अधिकारी को, राष्ट्रीय ताप विद्युत निगम लिमिटेड, एक निगमित निकाय, के अधिकारी होने के कारण तथा भारत सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारियों को रैंक के समकक्ष अधिकारी होने के कारण, उपरोक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए सम्पदा अधिकारी होने के लिए नियुक्त करती है, जो उक्त तालिका के कालम (3) में संबंधित विनिर्दिष्ट सरकारी स्थानों के संबंध में अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की स्थानीय सीमाओं के अन्दर, उपर्युक्त अधिनियम के द्वारा अथवा उसके सम्पदा अधिकारियों को प्रदत्त की गई शक्तियों का उपयोग करेगा तथा उसको सौंपे गए कर्तव्यों का पालन करेगा।

तालिका

क्रम अधिकारी का पदनाम सरकारी स्थानों की श्रेणियाँ तथा क्षेत्राधिकार की स्थानीय सीमाएँ

1	2	3
1. श्री एम० रामाकुण्डम राव विधि अधिकारी	ज्योति नगर, जिला करोम नगर, ग्राम प्रवेश में राष्ट्रीय ताप विद्युत निगम की रामागुण्डम सुपर ताप विद्युत परियोजना के स्वामित्व की, पट्टे पर ली गई अथवा किराये पर ली गयी सभी भूमियाँ, क्वार्टर, सम्पदा, सम्पत्तियाँ और अन्य आवास।	

[सं० 5(5)/81-यू०एस०डी-VI]
के०एन० भटनगर अधर सचिव

MINISTRY OF ENERGY

(Department of Power)

New Delhi, the 15th January, 1983

S. O. 776—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971), the Central Government hereby appoints the officer mentioned in column (2) of the Table below, being an officer of the National Thermal Power Corporation limited, a Corporate authority, and being an officer

equivalent to the rank of gazetted officer of the Government of India, to be the estate officer for the purposes of the said Act, who shall exercise the powers conferred and perform the duties imposed on an estate officer by or under the said Act within the local limits of his jurisdiction, in respect of the public premises specified in the corresponding entry in column (3) of the said Table.

TABLE

S. No.	Designation of officer	Categories of Public Premises and local limits of jurisdiction
1	2	3
1.	Shri M. Rama Krishna Rao, Law Officer	All lands, quarters, estate, properties and other accommodation owned, leased or rented by Ramagundam Super Thermal Power Project of National Thermal Power Corporation Ltd. in Jyoti Nagar, Distt. Karim Nagar, Andhra Pradesh.

[No-5 (5)/81-US D-VI]

K. N. BHATNAGAR, Under Secy,

(पेट्रोलियम विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 28 जनवरी, 1983

कां०मा० 777.—यह: पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पार्सपन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के ऊर्जा मंत्रालय (पेट्रोलियम विभाग) की अधिसूचना कां०मा० सं० 3085 तारीख 4-9-82 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों के उपयोग के अधिकार को पावर राईट को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना प्राण्य घोषित कर दिया था।

श्री: भट्टनगर अधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन सरकार की रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

श्रीर भागे, यह: केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने या विनिश्चय किया है।

अब अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद् द्वारा घोषित करती है, कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पार्सपन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद् द्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

श्रीर भट्टनगर उक्त धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने के बजाए हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड मुम्बई के क्षेत्रीकरण में सभी धाराओं से एक रूप में घोषणा के प्रकाशन को तारीख से निहित होगा।

अनुसूची				
पार्श्व लाईन वाइसर्ड से बंधन कक, तालुका :- मावल, जिला :-				
पुणे राज्य :- महाराष्ट्र				
गांव	खसरा नंम्बर	हिस्सा नंम्बर	क्षेत्रफल	
			हेक्टर	ऐयर
1	2	3	4	
वाक्सर्ड	00 का भाग	--	00	00
	132 का भाग	--	00	29
	133 का भाग	--	00	17
	134 का भाग	--	00	17
	135 का भाग	--	00	04
	139 का भाग	--	00	31
	140 का भाग	--	00	21
	141 का भाग	--	00	09
	144 का भाग	--	00	48
	145 का भाग	--	00	13
	148 का भाग	--	00	11
	149 का भाग	--	00	04
	150 का भाग	--	00	13
	160 का भाग	--	00	13
वरसोली	23 का भाग	--	00	37
	24 का भाग	--	00	29
	47 का भाग	--	00	59
	49 का भाग	--	00	40
	60 का भाग	--	00	59
लोणावला	63 का भाग	--	00	04
	144 का भाग	--	00	24
	144 का भाग	--	00	05
	144 का भाग	--	00	18
	149 का भाग	--	00	04
बलवन	169 का भाग	--	00	20
	14 का भाग	--	00	37
	15 का भाग	--	00	04
	33 का भाग	--	00	20
	34 का भाग	--	00	11
	35 का भाग	--	00	04
	38 का भाग	--	00	05
	40 का भाग	--	00	04
	41 का भाग	--	00	05
	41 का भाग	--	00	13
	00 का भाग	--	00	00
	42 का भाग	--	00	05
	43 का भाग	--	00	16
	44 का भाग	--	00	13
	45 का भाग	--	00	11
	50 का भाग	--	00	20
	51 का भाग	--	00	20
	52 का भाग	--	00	16
	65 का भाग	--	00	31
	66 का भाग	--	00	13
	70 का भाग	--	00	05
	80 का भाग	--	00	13
	83 का भाग	--	00	38
	94 का भाग	--	00	18

गांव	खसरा नंम्बर	हिस्सा नम्बर	क्षेत्रफल	
			हेक्टर	ऐयर
1	2	3	4	
	95 का भाग	--	00	22
	189 का भाग	--	00	16

[नं० O-12016/26/82-प्रोड-II]

(Department of Petroleum)

New Delhi, the 28th January, 1983

S.O. 777.—Whereas by a notification of Government of India in the Ministry of Energy (Department of Petroleum) S.O. 3085 (No. 12016/28/82 prod. II) dated 4-9-82 under Sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the Right of User in the Lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline.

And whereas the Competent Authority has under Sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act submitted report to the Government.

And further the Central Government has after considering the said report, decided to acquire the right of user in the Lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification.

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of the said Act the said Act the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification are hereby acquired for laying the pipelines.

And further, in exercise of the power conferred by Sub-section (4) of that section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in the Central Government vest on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Hindustan Petroleum Corp. Ltd., Bombay free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Pipeline from Waksai to Valvan. Taluka :-Mawal,
Dist :- Pune. (Maharashtra)

Village	Survey No./Gat No.	Hisa No.	AREA	
			H	R
1	2	3	4	
Waksai	132 Part	--	00	29
	133 Part	--	00	17
	134 Part	--	00	17
	135 Part	--	00	04
	139 Part	--	00	31
	140 A Part	--	00	21
	141 Part	--	00	09
	144 Part	--	00	48
	145 Part	--	00	13
	148 Part	--	00	11
	149 Part	--	00	04
	150 Part	--	00	13
Varsoli	160 Part	--	00	13
	23 Part	--	00	37
	24 Part	--	00	27
	47 Part	--	00	59
	49 Part	--	00	40

Village	Survey No./ Gat.	Hissa No	AREA	
			H	N
1	2	3	4	
Lonavla	60 Part	—	00	59
	63 Part	—	00	04
	144 A Part	—	00	24
	144 B Part	—	00	05
	144 Part	—	00	18
	145 Part	—	00	04
Valvan	169 Part	—	00	20
	14 Part	—	00	37
	15 Part	—	00	04
	33 Part	—	00	20
	34 Part	—	00	11
	35 Part	—	00	04
	38 Part	—	00	05
	40 A Part	—	00	04
	41 A Part	—	00	05
	41B Part	—	00	18
	42 Part	—	00	05
	43 Part	—	00	16
	44 Part	—	00	13
	45 Part	—	00	11
	50 Part	—	00	20
	51 Part	—	00	20
	52 Part	—	00	16
	65 Part	—	00	31
	66 Part	—	00	13
	70 Part	—	00	05
	80 Part	—	00	13
	83 Part	—	00	38
	94 Part	—	00	18
	95 Part	—	00	22
	189 Part	—	00	16

[No. O-12016/26/ 2-Prod. II]

का० भा० 778.—यस: पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पार्सप्लाईन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के ऊर्जा मंत्रालय (पेट्रोलियम विभाग) की अधिसूचना का० भा० सं० 3082 तारीख 4/9/82 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों के उपयोग के अधिकार को पार्सप्लाईन विछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना आशय घोषित कर दिया था।

और अतः सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अथ अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद् द्वारा घोषित करती है, कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पार्सप्लाईन विछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद् द्वारा अर्जित किया जाना है।

और आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने के बजाए हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड मुंबई के अधीनस्थान में सनी बाधाओं से मुक्त रूप से प्रयोग के प्रकाशन की तारीख से निहित होगा।

पार्सप्लाईन बाणी से साप्लाडा तक,
ताबुका :- ठाणे, जिला :- ठाणे, राज्य :- महाराष्ट्र

गांव	खसरा नम्बर	हिससा नम्बर	क्षेत्रफल	
			हेक्टर	ऐयर
बाशी	00 का भाग	—	00	00
	3 का भाग	—	00	70
	4 का भाग	—	00	22
तुर्मे	6 का भाग	—	00	75
	17 का भाग	—	00	14
	726 का भाग	—	00	05
	738 का भाग	—	00	18
	740 का भाग	—	00	16
	741 का भाग	—	00	04
	742 का भाग	—	00	02
साप्लाडा	796 का भाग	—	00	42
	29 का भाग	—	00	10
	30 का भाग	—	00	03
	36 का भाग	—	00	13
	37 का भाग	—	00	04
	38 का भाग	—	00	09
	39 का भाग	—	00	12
	40 का भाग	—	00	15
	41 का भाग	—	00	18
	42 का भाग	—	00	02
	46 का भाग	—	00	05
	47 का भाग	—	00	09
	50 का भाग	—	00	20
	58 का भाग	—	00	06
	77 का भाग	—	00	02

[क्रमांक O-12068/27/82-प्रौ०]

S.O. 778.—Whereas by a notification of Government of India in the Ministry of Energy (Department of Petroleum) S.O. 3082 (No. 12016/27/82-Prod I) dated 4-9-82 under Sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the Right of User in the Lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline.

And whereas the Competent Authority has under Sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act submitted report to the Government.

And further the Central Government has after considering the said report, decided to acquire the right of user in the Lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by Sub-section (1) of the Section 6 of the said Act the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification are hereby acquired for laying the pipelines.

And further, in exercise of the power conferred by Sub-section (4) of that section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in the Central Government vest on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Hindustan Petroleum Corp. Ltd., Bombay free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Pipeline From Vashi to Sapada
Taluka : Thana, Dist : Thana, Maharashtra.

Village	Survey No./ Gut No.	Hissa No.	Area	
			H	R
Vashi	Part.	—	—	—
	3 Part	—	00	70
	4 Part	—	00	22
	6 Part	—	00	75
Turbhe	17 Part	—	00	14
	726 Part	—	00	05
	739 Part	—	00	18
	740 Part	—	00	16
	741 Part	—	00	04
	742 Part	—	00	02
	796 Part	—	00	42
Sanpada	29 Part	—	00	10
	30 Part	—	00	03
	36 Part	—	00	13
	37 Part	—	00	04
	38 Part	—	00	09
	40 Part	—	00	15
	41 Part	—	00	18
	39 Part	—	00	12
	42 Part	—	00	02
	46 Part	—	00	05
	47 Part	—	00	09
	50 Part	—	00	20
	58 Part	—	00	06
	77 Part	—	00	02

[No. 0-12016/27/82-Prod.]

नई दिल्ली, 31 जनवरी, 1983

कां०आ० 779.—यस: पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पार्श्वलाइन (भूमि के उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के ऊर्जा मंत्रालय (पेट्रोलियम विभाग) की अधिसूचना कां० आ० सं० 3086 तारीख 4-9-82 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों के उपयोग के अधिकार को पार्श्वलाइन को विछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना आशय व्यक्त कर दिया था।

और यस: सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे, यस: केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार पार्श्वलाइन अर्जित करती है, कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पार्श्वलाइन विछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए पार्श्वलाइन द्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार में निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार निहित होने के बजाए हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड मुंबई के क्षेत्राधिकार में सभी बाधाओं से मुक्त रूप में पार्श्वलाइन के प्रयोजन का तरीका से निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

पार्श्व लाइन कसबे महाबाज से आदई तक, तालुका :—ठाणे, जिला—ठाणे, राज्य :—महाराष्ट्र

गांव	खसरा नम्बर	हिस्सा नम्बर	क्षेत्रफल	
			हेक्टर	ऐयर
कसबे महाबाज	00 का भाग	—	00	00
	365 का भाग	—	00	14
	372 का भाग	—	00	14
	374 का भाग	—	00	02
	375 का भाग	—	00	03
	376 का भाग	—	00	23
	377 का भाग	—	00	02
	377 का भाग	—	00	07
	377 का भाग	—	00	02
	387 का भाग	—	00	08
	388 का भाग	—	00	02
	389 का भाग	—	00	37
	390 का भाग	—	00	06
	391 का भाग	—	00	41
	488 का भाग	—	00	12
	489 का भाग	—	00	02
महाबाज	29 का भाग	—	00	09
	30 का भाग	—	00	08
	33 का भाग	—	00	23
	36 का भाग	—	00	27
	37 का भाग	—	00	12
	38 का भाग	—	00	09
	40 का भाग	—	00	05
	53 का भाग	—	00	82
	162 का भाग	—	00	06
	193 का भाग	—	00	20
तलोडा	194 का भाग	—	00	38
	195 का भाग	—	00	08
	195 का भाग	—	00	04
	188 का भाग	—	00	02
	189 का भाग	—	00	05
	198 का भाग	—	00	27
	200 का भाग	—	00	13
	201 का भाग	—	00	32
	488 का भाग	—	00	09
	489 का भाग	—	00	04
कामोडे	308 का भाग	—	00	42
	76 का भाग	—	00	06
बेलपाडा	77 का भाग	—	00	06
	5 का भाग	—	00	55
	6 का भाग	—	00	10
	8 का भाग	—	00	23
	17 का भाग	—	00	24
	29 का भाग	—	00	04
	30 का भाग	—	00	02
	31 का भाग	—	00	05
	32 का भाग	—	00	08
	33 का भाग	—	00	16

गाँव	खसरा नम्बर	हिस्सा नम्बर	क्षेत्रफल		Village	Survey No / Gut No.	Hissa No	Area	
			हैक्टर	ऐकर				H	R
बेलपाडा	17 का भाग	--	00	02	Shahbaz	36 Part	--	00	27
	38 का भाग	--	00	04		37 Part	--	00	12
	39 का भाग	--	00	31		38 Part	--	00	09
आदई	129 का भाग	--	00	11		40B Part	--	00	05
	130 का भाग	--	00	07		53 Part	--	00	62
	131 का भाग	--	00	50		162 Part	--	00	06
	132 का भाग	--	00	16		188 Part	--	00	02
						189 Part	--	00	05
						193 Part	--	00	20
						194 Part	--	00	38
[क्रमांक 0-12016/28/82 प्रो. 1]									

[क्रमांक 0-12016/28/82 प्रो. 1]

New Delhi, the 31st January, 1983

S.O. 779.—Whereas by a notification of Government of India in the Ministry of Energy (Department of Petroleum) S.O. 3086 (No. 12016/28/82 Prod I) dated 4-9-82 under Sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1952 (50 of 1962) the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the Right of User in the Lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline.

And whereas the Competent Authority has under Sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act submitted report to the Government.

And further the Central Government has after considering the said report, decided to acquire the right of user in the Lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification.

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of the Section 6 of the said Act the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification are hereby acquired for laying the pipelines.

And further, in exercise of the power conferred by Sub-section (4) of that section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in the Central Government vest on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Hindustan Petroleum Corp. Ltd, Bombay free from all encumbrances

SCHEDULE

Pipeline From Kasbe, Shahabaz to Aadace.

Taluka : Thana, Dist ; Thane, Maharashtra.

Village	Survey No./ Gut No.	Hissa No	Area	
			H	R
Kasbe Shahabaz.	Part.	---	---	---
	365 Part	---	00	14
	372 Part	---	00	14
	374 Part	---	00	02
	375B Part	---	00	03
	376 Part	---	00	23
	377A Part	---	00	02
	377B Part	---	00	07
	377K Part	---	00	02
	387 Part	---	00	08
	388 Part	---	00	02
	389 Part	---	00	37
	390 Part	---	00	06
	391A Part	---	00	41
	488 Part	---	00	12
	489 Part	---	00	02
Shahbaz	29 Part	---	00	09
	30 A Part	---	00	08
	33A Part	---	00	23

[No. O-12016/28/82-Prod. 1]

का० आ० 780.—यतः पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाईपलाइन (भूमि के उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के ऊर्जा मंत्रालय (पेट्रोलियम विभाग) की अधिसूचना का० आ० सं० 3087 तारीख 4-9-82 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों के उपयोग के अधिकार को पाईप लाइन को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना आशय घोषित कर दिया था।

और अतः सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करते के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रवक्ष अधिकारों का प्रयोग करने हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है, कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाईप लाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रवक्ष अधिकारों का प्रयोग करने हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार में निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में

उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने के बजाए हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड मुंबई के क्षेत्रीकरण में सभी बाधाओं से मुक्त रूप में घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख से निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

पाईप लाईन खारबर से घासुङगाव तक, तालुका :—पनवेल,
जिला :—रायगढ़, राज्य :—महाराष्ट्र

गांव	खसरा नम्बर	हिस्सा नम्बर	क्षेत्रफल	
			हेक्टर	ऐयर
खारबर	00 का भाग	--	00	00
	79 का भाग	--	00	55
	89 का भाग	--	00	06
	91 का भाग	--	00	38
	92 का भाग	--	00	21
	95 का भाग	--	00	25
	96 का भाग	--	00	31
	113 का भाग	--	00	30
	117 का भाग	--	00	16
	118 का भाग	--	00	04
	128 का भाग	--	00	07
	129 का भाग	--	00	05
	130 का भाग	--	00	04
	131 का भाग	--	00	04
	132 का भाग	--	00	33
	191 का भाग	--	00	04
	133 का भाग	--	00	18
	192 का भाग	--	00	28
	194 का भाग	--	00	06
	196 का भाग	--	00	16
	199 का भाग	--	00	33
	205 का भाग	--	00	41
	206 का भाग	--	00	29
	208 ए का भाग	--	00	03
	208 ब का भाग	--	00	07
	209 ब का भाग	--	00	39
	210 का भाग	--	00	04
	213 का भाग	--	00	06
	214 का भाग	--	00	37
	215 का भाग	--	00	04
	233 ए का भाग	--	00	27
	234 ए का भाग	--	00	11
	235 का भाग	--	00	06
	236 का भाग	--	00	04
	238 का भाग	--	00	10
	256 का भाग	--	00	55
कालम्बोली	00 का भाग	--	00	00
	1 का भाग	--	00	20
	3 का भाग	--	00	07
	4 का भाग	--	00	31
	5 का भाग	--	00	06
	12 का भाग	--	00	20
	13 का भाग	--	00	04
	17 का भाग	--	00	15
	18 का भाग	--	00	06
	20 का भाग	--	00	13

गांव	खसरा नम्बर	हिस्सा नम्बर	क्षेत्रफल	
			हेक्टर	ऐयर
कालम्बोली	21 का भाग	--	00	32
	22 का भाग	--	00	37
	23 का भाग	--	00	05
	25 का भाग	--	00	13
	95 का भाग	--	00	33
	96 का भाग	--	00	12
	97 का भाग	--	00	43
	98 का भाग	--	00	04
	119 का भाग	--	00	52
	128 ए का भाग	--	00	06
घासुङगाव	129 ए का भाग	--	00	14
	1 का भाग	--	00	35
	2 का भाग	--	00	27
	7 का भाग	--	00	08
	43 का भाग	--	00	10
	44 का भाग	--	00	05
	45 का भाग	--	00	22
	46 का भाग	--	50	27
	47 का भाग	--	00	04
	49 का भाग	--	00	17
	50 का भाग	--	00	06
	52 का भाग	--	00	09
	53 का भाग	--	00	40
	59 का भाग	--	00	80
	68 का भाग	--	00	14
	78 का भाग	--	00	10
	79 का भाग	--	00	24

[क्रमांक 0-12016/28/82-प्रो II]

S.O. 780.—Whereas by a notification of Government of India in the Ministry of Energy (Department of Petroleum) S.O. 3087(No. 12016/28/82 Prod II) dated 4-9-82 under Sub-section (I) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the Right of User in the Lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline.

And whereas the Competent Authority has under Sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act submitted report to the Government.

And further the Central Government has after considering the said report, decided to acquire the right of user in the Lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification.

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of the Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification are hereby acquired for laying the pipelines.

And further, in exercise of the power conferred by Sub-section (4) of that section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in the Central Government vest on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Hindustan Petroleum Corp. Ltd., Bombay free from all encumbrances

SCHEDULE				Village	Survey No./ G. No.	Hissa No.	Area	
Pipeline From Kharghar to Asudgaon.							H	R
Taluka :—Panvel, Distt :—Raigad, Maharashtra								
Village	Survey No./ G No.	Hissa No.	Area					
			H R					
Kharghar	79 Part	—	00 55	Asudgaon	44 Part	—	00	05
	89 Part	—	00 06	—(Contd.)	45 Part	—	00	22
	91 Part	—	00 38		46 Part	—	00	27
	92 Part	—	00 21		47 Part	—	00	04
	95 Part	—	00 25		49 Part	—	00	17
	96 Part	—	00 31		50 Part	—	00	06
	113 Part	—	00 30		52 Part	—	00	09
	117 Part	—	00 16		53 Part	—	00	40
	118 Part	—	00 04		59 Part	—	00	80
	128 Part	—	00 07		68 Part	—	00	14
	129 Part	—	00 05		78 Part	—	00	10
	130 Part	—	00 04		79 Part	—	00	24
	131 Part	—	00 04					
	132 Part	—	00 33					
	191 Part	—	00 04					
	133 Part	—	00 18					
	192 Part	—	00 28					
	194 Part	—	00 06					
	196 Part	—	00 16					
	199 Part	—	00 33					
	205 Part	—	00 41					
	206 Part	—	00 29					
	208A Part	—	00 03					
	208B Part	—	00 07					
	209B Part	—	00 39					
	210 Part	—	00 04					
	213 Part	—	00 06					
	214 Part	—	00 37					
	215 Part	—	00 04					
	233A Part	—	00 27					
	234A Part	—	00 11					
	235 Part	—	00 06					
	236 Part	—	00 04					
	238 Part	—	00 10					
	256 Part	—	00 55					
Kalambohi	1 Part	—	00 20					
	3 Part	—	00 07					
	4 Part	—	00 31					
	5 Part	—	00 06					
	12 Part	—	00 20					
	13 Part	—	00 04					
	17 part	—	00 15					
	18 Part	—	00 06					
	20 part	—	00 13					
	21 Part	—	00 32					
	22 Part	—	00 37					
	23 Part	—	00 05					
	25 Part	—	00 13					
	95 Part	—	00 33					
	96 Part	—	00 12					
	97 Part	—	00 43					
	98 Part	—	00 04					
Asudgaon	119 Part	—	00 52					
	128A Part	—	00 06					
	129A Part	—	00 14					
	1 Part	—	00 35					
	2 Part	—	00 27					
	7 Part	—	00 08					
	42 Part	—	00 10					

[No. 0-12016/28/82-Prod.]

का० अ(० 781 --यत पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पार्श्वलाइन (भूमि के उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 का उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के ऊर्जा मंत्रालय (पेट्रोलियम विभाग) का अधिसूचना का०अ० सं० 3096 तारीख 4-9-82 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियां के उपयोग के अधिकार का पार्श्व लाइन को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना आग्रह घोषित कर दिया था।

और आ सक्षम अधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे, यत केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद् द्वारा घोषित करती है, कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पार्श्व लाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्द्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार में निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने के बजाए हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड मुम्बई के क्षेत्रीकरण में सभी बाधाओं से मुक्त रूप से घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख से निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

पार्श्व लाइन टाकवे खुद से खडकासे तक, तालुका : मावल, जिला : रायगड,

महाराष्ट्र

गांव	खसरा नम्बर	हिस्सा नम्बर	क्षेत्रफल	
			हेक्टर	ऐकर
टाकवे खुद	00 का भाग	—	00	00
"	69 का भाग	—	00	01
"	70 का भाग	—	00	05
"	76 का भाग	—	00	02
"	77 का भाग	—	00	57
"	81 का भाग	—	00	34
"	112 का भाग	—	00	20
"	219 का भाग	—	00	19
"	239 का भाग	—	00	01
"	241 का भाग	—	00	04

गांव	खसरा नम्बर	हिस्सा नं.	क्षेत्रफल हेक्टर	ऐयर
टाकवे खुर्द—(जारी)	241 का भाग	—	00	10
"	245 का भाग	—	00	05
"	246 का भाग	—	00	07
"	262 का भाग	—	00	18
"	264 का भाग	—	00	25
"	265 का भाग	—	00	11
"	266 का भाग	—	00	04
"	268 का भाग	—	00	01
"	273 का भाग	—	00	01
"	274 का भाग	—	00	34
"	276 का भाग	—	00	16
"	279 का भाग	—	00	02
"	369 का भाग	—	00	20
"	370 का भाग	—	00	18
नाणे	324 का भाग	—	00	03
"	325 का भाग	—	00	13
"	327 का भाग	—	00	01
"	330 का भाग	—	00	42
"	331 का भाग	—	00	17
"	332 का भाग	—	00	01
"	337 का भाग	—	00	12
"	341 का भाग	—	00	25
"	342 का भाग	—	00	24
"	361 का भाग	—	00	54
"	364 का भाग	—	00	40
नाणे	00 का भाग	—	00	00
"	365 का भाग	—	00	03
"	366 का भाग	—	00	57
"	367 का भाग	—	00	08
"	383 का भाग	—	00	26
खडकाले	32 का भाग	—	00	03
"	33 का भाग	—	00	53
"	34 का भाग	—	00	36
"	35 का भाग	—	00	46
"	53 का भाग	—	00	09
"	55 का भाग	—	00	22
"	56 का भाग	—	00	55
"	57 का भाग	—	00	09
"	69 का भाग	—	00	36
"	70 का भाग	—	00	11

[क्रमांक 0-12016/42/82-प्रो-0-]

S.O. 781.—Whereas by a notification of Government of India in the Ministry of Energy (Department of Petroleum) S.O. 3096 (No. 12016/42/82-Prod. I) dated 4-9-82 under Sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the Right of User in the Lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline.

And whereas the Competent Authority has under Sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act submitted report to the Government.

And further the Central Government has after considering the said report, decided to acquire the right of user in the Lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by Sub-section (1) of the Section 6 of the said Act the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification are hereby acquired for laying the pipelines.

And further, in exercise of the power conferred by Sub-section (4) of that section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in the Central Government vest on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Hindustan Petroleum Corp. Ltd, Bongaivav free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Pipeline From Tak Khurd to Khadkale

Taluka : Mawal, Dist : Pune, Maharashtra.

Village	Survey No. & Gut N	Hissa No.	Area	
			H	R
Takve Khurd	69 Part	—	00	01
	70 Part	—	00	05
	76 Part	—	00	02
	77 Part	—	00	57
	81 Part	—	00	34
	212 Part	—	00	20
	219 Part	—	00	19
	239 Part	—	00	01
	241 Part	—	00	04
	244 Part	—	00	10
	245 part	—	00	05
	246 Part	—	00	07
	262 Part	—	00	18
	264 Part	—	00	25
	265 Part	—	00	11
	266 Part	—	00	04
	268 Part	—	00	01
	273 Part	—	00	01
	274 Part	—	00	34
	276 Part	—	00	16
Nanhe	279 Part	—	00	02
	369 Part	—	00	20
	370 Part	—	00	18
	324 Part	—	00	03
	325 part	—	00	13
	327 Part	—	00	01
	330 Part	—	00	42
	331 Part	—	00	17
	332 Part	—	00	01
	337 Part	—	00	12
Khadkale	341 Part	—	00	25
	342 Part	—	00	24
	361 Part	—	00	54
	364 Part	—	00	40
	365 Part	—	00	03
	366 Part	—	00	57
	367 Part	—	00	08
	383 Part	—	00	26
	32 Part	—	00	03
	33A Part	—	00	53
	34 Part	—	00	36
	35 Part	—	00	46
	53 Part	—	00	09
	55 Part	—	00	22
	56 Part	—	00	55
	57 Part	—	00	09
	69 Part	—	00	36
	70 Part	—	00	11

[No. O-12019/42/82-Prod.]

का० आ० 782.—यतः पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाईपलाइन (भूमि के उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के ऊर्जा मंत्रालय (पेट्रोलियम विभाग) की अधिसूचना का० आ० सं० 3093 तारीख 4-9-82 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उन अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों के उपयोग के अधिकार को पाईप लाईन को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना आशय घोषित कर दिया था।

और अतः सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों के उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिश्चय किया है।

अब अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है, कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार पाईप लाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और आगे उस धारा की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने निर्देश देनी है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने के बजाए हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, मुंबई के क्षेत्रीकरण में सभी बाधाओं से मुक्त रूप से घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख से निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

पाईप लाईन शिलातने, तालुका : मावल, जिला : पुणे महाराष्ट्र

गांव	खसरा नम्बर	हिस्सा नम्बर	क्षेत्रफल	हैक्टर	ऐयर
शिलातने	00 का भाग	—	00	00	
"	4 का भाग	—	00	14	
"	5 का भाग	—	00	19	
"	6 का भाग	—	00	26	
"	7 का भाग	—	00	15	
"	8 का भाग	—	00	01	
"	10 का भाग	—	00	03	
"	165 का भाग	—	00	18	
"	187 का भाग	—	00	18	
"	188 का भाग	—	00	12	
"	189 का भाग	—	00	09	
"	190 का भाग	—	00	12	
"	192 का भाग	—	00	09	
"	193 का भाग	—	00	04	
"	195 का भाग	—	00	21	
"	197 का भाग	—	00	05	
"	198 का भाग	—	00	17	
"	199 का भाग	—	00	01	
"	200 का भाग	—	00	07	
"	201 का भाग	—	00	16	
"	205 का भाग	—	00	01	
"	215 का भाग	—	00	13	
"	216 का भाग	—	00	04	
"	219 का भाग	—	00	24	

[क्रमांक 0-12016/32/82-प्रो II]

S.O. 782.—Whereas by a notification of Government of India in the Ministry of Energy (Department of Petroleum)

S.O. 3093 (No. 12016/32/82-Prod. II) dated 4-9-82 under Sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the Right of User in the Lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline.

And whereas the Competent Authority has under Sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act submitted report to the Government.

And further the Central Government has after considering the said report, decided to acquire the right of user in the Lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification.

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of the Section 6 of the said Act the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification are hereby acquired for laying the pipelines.

And further, in exercise of the power conferred by Sub-section (4) of that section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in the Central Government vest on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Hindustan Petroleum Corp. Ltd., Bombay free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Pipeline From Shilatane.

Taluka : Mawal Dist : Pune State : Maharashtra

Village	Survey No./ Gat No.	Hissa No.	Area	
			H	R
Shilatane	4 Part	—	00	14
	5 Part	—	00	19
	6 Part	—	00	26
	7 Part	—	00	15
	8 Part	—	00	01
	10 Part	—	00	03
	165 Part	—	00	18
	187 Part	—	00	18
	188 Part	—	00	12
	189 Part	—	00	09
	190 Part	—	00	12
	192 Part	—	00	09
	193 Part	—	00	04
	195 Part	—	00	21
	197 Part	—	00	05
	198 Part	—	00	17
	199 Part	—	00	01
	200 Part	—	00	07
	201 Part	—	00	16
	205 Part	—	00	01
	215 Part	—	00	13
	216 Part	—	00	04
	219 Part	—	00	24

[No. 0-20/6/32/82-Prod. II]

का० आ० 783.—यतः पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाईपलाइन (भूमि के उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के ऊर्जा मंत्रालय (पेट्रोलियम विभाग) की अधिसूचना का० आ० सं० 3092 तारीख 4-9-82 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उन अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों के उपयोग के अधिकार को पाईप लाईन को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए अर्जित करने का अपना आशय घोषित कर दिया था।

और अतः सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन सरकार को रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

और आगे, यह केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् इस अधिसूचना से सलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का विनिर्देश किया है।

अब अतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करने हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से सलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त भूमियों का अधिकार पाईर लाइन विद्युत के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अर्जित किया जाता है।

और आगे उस धारा का उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करने हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार में निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमियों में उपयोग का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने के बजाय हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड मुंबई के क्षेत्रीकरण में सभी बाधाओं में मुक्त रूप से घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख से निहित होगी।

अनुसूची

पाईर लाईन मुडावरे से नायगाव तक, तालुका मावल, जिला पूणे,

महाराष्ट्र

गांव	खसरा न०	हिस्सन	क्षेत्रफल	हैक्टर	गुंजर
1	2	3	4	5	
मुडावरे	00 का भाग	—	00	00	
"	77 का भाग	—	00	15	
"	91 का भाग	—	00	21	
"	93 का भाग	—	00	13	
"	94 का भाग	—	00	01	
"	96 का भाग	—	00	11	
"	102 का भाग	—	00	22	
"	101 का भाग	—	00	28	
"	110 का भाग	—	00	26	
"	111 का भाग	—	00	08	
"	112 का भाग	—	00	33	
"	113 का भाग	—	00	27	
"	114 का भाग	—	00	01	
"	125 का भाग	—	00	01	
"	80 का भाग	—	00	14	
"	85 का भाग	—	00	49	
बलक	86 का भाग	—	00	14	
"	87 का भाग	—	00	26	
वडीवले	10 का भाग	—	00	33	
"	15 का भाग	—	00	20	
"	16 का भाग	—	00	16	
"	17 का भाग	—	00	23	
"	18 का भाग	—	00	03	
"	23 का भाग	—	00	03	
"	24 का भाग	—	00	21	
"	25 का भाग	—	00	37	
"	27 का भाग	—	00	05	
"	28 का भाग	—	00	19	
नायगाव	81 का भाग	—	00	06	
"	86 का भाग	—	00	54	
"	87 का भाग	—	00	12	
"	88 का भाग	—	00	16	
"	89 का भाग	—	00	26	
"	135 का भाग	—	00	43	

1	2	3	4	5
"	136 का भाग	—	00	08
"	148 का भाग	—	00	22
"	148 का भाग	—	00	21

[क्रमांक 0-12016/32/82-प्रोड-0-1]

एल० एम० गोयल, निदेशक

S.O. 783.—Whereas by a notification of Government of India in the Ministry of Energy (Department of Petroleum) S.O. 3092 (No. 12016/32/82 prod I) dated 4-9-82 under Sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the Right of User in the Lands specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline.

And whereas the Competent Authority has under Sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act submitted report to the Government.

And further the Central Government has after considering the said report, decided to acquire the right of user in the Lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification.

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of the Section 6 of the said Act the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the schedule appended to this notification are hereby acquired for laying the pipelines.

And further, in exercise of the power conferred by Sub-section (4) of that section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall instead of vesting in the Central Government vest on this date of the publication of this declaration in the Hindustan Petroleum Corp. Ltd., Bombay free from all encumbrances

SCHEDULE

Pipeline From Mundawar to Naigaon
Taluka : Mawal, Dist. Pune State : Maharashtra

Village	Survey No. Cat No.	Hissa No.	Area	
			H	R
1	2	3	4	5
Mundaware	77 Part.	—	00	45
	91 Part.	—	00	21
	93 Part.	—	00	13
	94 Part.	—	00	01
	96 Part.	—	00	11
	102 Part.	—	00	22
	101 Part.	—	00	28
	110 Part.	—	00	26
	111 Part.	—	00	08
	112 Part.	—	00	33
	113 part.	—	00	27
	114 Part.	—	00	01
	125 Part.	—	00	01
	80 Part.	—	00	14
	85 Part.	—	00	49
Walak	86 Part.	—	00	14
	87 Part.	—	00	26
Wadivale	10 Part.	—	00	23
	15 Part.	—	00	20
	16 Part.	—	00	16
	17 Part.	—	00	23

1	2	3	4	5
	18 Part.	—	00	03
	23 Part.	—	00	03
	24 Part.	—	00	21
	25 Part.	—	00	37
	27 Part.	—	00	05
	28 Part.	—	00	19
Naigaon	81 Part.	—	00	06
	86 Part.	—	00	54
	87 Part.	—	00	12
	88 Part.	—	00	16
	89 Part.	—	00	5
	135 Part.	—	00	43
	136 Part.	—	00	08
	148 Part.	—	00	22
	149 Part.	—	00	21

[No. 0-12016/32/82-Proc. I]

L. M. GOYAL, Director.

1	2
5. डा० डी० के० मालूखे, कुलपति, महात्मा फूले कृषि विद्यापीठ, राहुरी।	—वही—
6. ड० एम० एन० द्विवेदी, निदेशक, केन्द्रीय मछली पालन शिक्षा संस्थान, बम्बई।	
7. श्री नवाब सिंह यादव, भूतपूर्व-एम०एल० सी०, सी०-1/2 रिवर बैंक कालोनी, लखनऊ (उ०प्र०)	

कृषि मंत्रालय

[संख्या 2(1)/82-सी०डी० एन०-1]

(कृषि अनुसंधान और शिक्षा विभाग)

एम० जी० मैतन, अवर सचिव

नई दिल्ली, 20 दिसम्बर, 1982

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

(Department of Agricultural Research & Education)

New Delhi, the 20th December, 1982

का०आ० 784.—भारतीय कृषि अनुसंधान परिषद द्वारा बनायी गयी स्थायी वित्त समिति को नियमावली के विनियम 2 (iv) के अनुसरण में तथा ए० पी० उपकर, 1940 की धारा 7(2) में दिये गये प्रावधान के अनुसरण में, भारतीय कृषि अनुसंधान परिषद के शासी निकाय द्वारा निकाय में निम्नलिखित सदस्यों को 30-9-82 से एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिए, जिसका उल्लेख प्रत्येक सदस्य के नाम के सामने किया गया है, स्थायी वित्त समिति का सदस्य चुन लिया गया है:—

नाम	अवधि
1	2
1. श्री चन्द्रशेखर सिंह सदस्य, लोक सभा, पो० आ० बांका, जिला-भागलपुर, बिहार	30-9-1982 से एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिए या उस समय तक के लिए जब तक वे शासी निकाय के सदस्य बने रहेंगे इनमें से जो भी पहले हो तब तक के लिए।
2. प्रो० एन० जी० रंगा, सदस्य, लोक सभा, निडुड्रोलु, पोन्दुर (आ०प्र०)	
3. श्री सुजान सिंह, सदस्य, राज्य सभा, सुजान सिंह पार्क, सोनीपत, (हरियाणा)	दिनांक 30-9-1982 से एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिए अथवा उसके बाद जब तक उनके उत्तराधिकारी का विधिवत निर्वाचन न हो इनमें से जो भी बाद में हो तब तक के लिए।
4. डा० (श्रीमती) सुमिता राय, सहायक प्रोफेसर, गृह विज्ञान, विस्तार शिक्षा, गृह विज्ञान कालेज, पंजाब कृषि विश्वविद्यालय, लुधियाना।	

Name	Term
1	2
1. Shri Chandra Shekhar Singh, Member, Lok Sabha, At P.O. Banka, Dist. Bhagalpur, Bihar.	for a period of one year w.e.f. 30-9-82 or till such time as they continue to be members of the Governing Body, whichever is earlier.
2. P. of. N.G. Ranga, Member, Lok Sabha, Nidudrolu, Pondur (A.P.)	
3. Shri Sujan Singh, Member, Rajya Sabha, Sujan Singh Park, Sonapat (Haryana)	for a period of one year w.e.f. 30-9-82 or till such time thereafter as their successors are duly elected, whichever is later.
4. Dr. (Mrs.) Sumita Roy, Associate Professor, Home Science Extension Education, College of Home Science, Punjab Agricultural University Ludhiana.	
5. Dr. D.K. Salunkhe, Vice-Chancellor, Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth, Rahuri.	
6. Dr. S.N. Dwivedi, Director, Central Institute of Fisheries Education, Bombay.	

1	2
7. Shri Nawab Singh Yadav, Ex. M.L.C., C-1/2, River Bank Colony, Lucknow (U.P.)	As above

[No. 2(1)/82-Con. I]
M. G. MENON, Under Secy.

शिक्षा और संस्कृति मंत्रालय

(शिक्षा विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 15 दिसम्बर, 1982

का० आ० 783—केन्द्रीय सरकार, सरकारी स्थान (अप्राधिकृत अधिकारियों की वेदखली) अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए तथा निर्माण और आवास मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 1054, ता० 6 मई, 1972 को अधिकांत करते हुए नीचे दी गई सारणी के स्तंभ (1) में निर्दिष्ट अधिकारी को जो सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी की पंक्ति के समतुल्य का अधिकारी है, उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजन के लिए संपदा अधिकारी के रूप में नियुक्त करती है, जे उक्त सारणी के स्तंभ (2) में विनिर्दिष्ट सरकारी स्थानों की बाबत अपनी अधिकारिता की स्थानीय सीमाओं के भीतर उक्त अधिनियम द्वारा या उसके अधीन संपदा अधिकारियों को प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग और अधिरोपित कर्तव्यों का पालन करेगा।

सारणी

अधिकारी का पदाभिधान सरकारी स्थानों के प्रबंध और अधिकारिता की स्थानीय सीमाएं

1	2
वित्त और विकास अधिकारी, पंजाब विश्वविद्यालय, चंडीगढ़	पंजाब विश्वविद्यालय, चंडीगढ़ से संबंधित या उसके द्वारा पट्टे पर लिए गए और उसके प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अधीन परिसर जो संघ राज्यक्षेत्र चंडीगढ़ के चंडीगढ़ जिले, हरियाणा राज्य के करनाल और कुश्नपुर जिले, पंजाब राज्य के अमृतसर, होशियारपुर और लुधियाना जिले, और हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य के शिमला और छत्र जिले की राजस्व सीमाओं में स्थित हैं।

[सं० फा० 3-6/82-यू० 1]

एम० आर० कोलहटकर, संयुक्त सचिव

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE

(Department of Education)

New Delhi, the 15th December, 1982

S.O. 783.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971) and in-supersession of the notification of the Ministry of Works and Housing No. S.O. 1054 dated the 6th May, 1972, the Central Government hereby appoints the Officer mentioned in column (1) of the Table below, being an Officer equivalent to the rank of gazetted officer of Government, to be estate officer for the purpose of the said Act, who shall exercise the powers conferred and perform the duties imposed on the estate Officers by or under the said Act within the local limits of his jurisdiction in respect of the public premises specified in column (2) of the said Table.

TABLE

Designation of the officer	Categories of Public premises and local limits of jurisdiction
1	2
Finance and Development Officer, Punjab University, Chandigarh.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by and under the administrative control of the Punjab University, Chandigarh, situated in the revenue limits of Chandigarh District of the Union territory Chandigarh. Karnal and Kurukshetra districts in the State of Haryana, Amritsar, Hoshiarpur and Ludhiana districts in the State of Punjab and Simla and Chamba districts in the State of Himachal Pradesh.

[No. F.3-6/82-U.I.]

M. R. KOLHATKAR, Jt. Secy.

श्रम और पनर्वास मंत्रालय

(श्रम विभाग)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 18 दिसम्बर 1982

का०आ० 786:—केन्द्रीय सरकार को राय है कि इससे उपावह अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में (1) सेम्टल केटल ब्रीडिंग फार्म अलमधी (2) रीजनल स्टेशन फार फारेज प्रोडक्शन एण्ड डिमान्डेशन अलमधी के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच विद्यमान है,

और के ग्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद का न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है,

अतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिनके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री टी० अश्वराज होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय मद्रास में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या सेम्टल केटल ब्रीडिंग फार्म और राजनन स्टेशन फार फारेज प्रोडक्शन एण्ड डिमान्डेशन अलमधी, अवाधि मद्रास के प्रबंधन तंत्र की क्रमशः 18 और दो नैमित्तिक श्रमिकों की, जैसा कि उपावह में दिया गया है, सेवाओं को समाप्त करने की बार्वाई विधिक, उचित तथा न्यायोचित है, यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस, अनुतोष के हकदार है।

उपाबंध

सर्वश्री	अधिक
1. विरुमावोक्कारामू	कृषि श्रमिक
2. बी० कुमार	”
3. एस० कुमार	”
4. डी० धाना	”

1	2	3	4
5. जयचन्दन	कृषि श्रमिक	7. K. Nagan	Agricultural Labourer
6. बी० मोहन	"	8. R. Muthukrishnan	-do-
7. के० नंगन	"	9. K. Kempuvel	-do-
8. आर० मुयकुण्णन	"	10. K. Masilamony	-do-
9. के० केम्पुवेल	"	11. R. Venkatesan	-do-
10. के० मसिलामनि	"	12. B. Kumudaa	-do-
11. आर० वेन्कटेशन	"	13. Jegada	-do-
12. बी० कुमुदा	"	14. Muthuraj	Watchmen
13. जगदा	"	15. B. Rajamani	Agricultural Labourer
14. मुथुराज	चौकीदार	16. M. Vijayakumar	-do-
15. बी० राजामनि	कृषि श्रमिक	17. Veeraraghavan	-do-
16. एम० विजयकुमार	"	18. P. Arunachalam	-do-
17. वीरराघवन	"		
18. पी० अरुनाचलम	"		

रीजनल स्टेशन फॉर फोरेज प्रोडक्शन एंड डिमॉन्स्ट्रेशन—

1. श्री एम० पी० सुब्रमनि— सहायक भंडारी
2. श्री बी० एन० परेतयानन— डिस्पैचिंग ऑफिसर बाय
[सं० एम-42011/19/81-डी-11(बी)],
एन० एस० प्रशर, डेस्क अधिकारी

[No. L-42011/19/81-D-II(B)]

S. S. PRASHER, Desk Officer

आदेश

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION

(Department of Labour)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 18th September, 1982

S.O. 786.—Whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of (I) Central Cattle Breeding Farm, Alamadhi and (II) Regional Station for Forage Production and Demonstration, Alamadhi and their workmen in respect of the matter, specified in the schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (I) of section 10 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri T. Arulraj shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Madras and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Central Cattle Breeding Farm and Regional Station for Forage Production and Demonstration at Alamadhi, Avadi, Madras in terminating the services of 18 and two casual workers respectively as furnished in the Annexure is legal, proper and justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?"

ANNEXURE

Sarvasbri :

1. Hhirunavaukarasu	Agricultural Labourer
2. B. Kumar	-do-
3. S. Kumar	-do-
4. D. Dhana	-do-
5. Jayachandran	-do-
6. V. Mohan	-do-

1233 GI/82—4

नई दिल्ली, 8 अक्टूबर, 1982

का०मा० 787.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में कर्नाटक बैंक लिमिटेड के प्रबन्धसूचक से सम्बद्ध एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच विद्यमान है,

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है,

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7—क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है, जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री बी० एच० उपाध्याय होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय बंगलूर में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

"क्या श्रमिकों की पिछली मजदूरी और देय बकाया राशियों सहित बहाली करने तथा श्री ओंकाराप्पा शंकरप्पा होंसूर की, जिसे कर्नाटक बैंक लिमिटेड की हुबली ब्रांच में रात्रि का चौकीदार नियुक्त किया गया था, सेवा को निरन्तर बनाए रखने की मांग न्यायोचित है? यदि हाँ, तो संबन्धित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं?"

[सं० एम-12012(12)/82/डी/4-ए]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 8th October, 1982

S.O. 787.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Karnataka Bank Limited and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed ;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10, of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri V. N. Upadhyaya shall be the Presiding Officer with headquarters at Bangalore and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

Whether the demands of the workmen for reinstatement with back-wages and arrears due, with continuity of service of Shri Onkarappa Shankarappa Hosur who was engaged at Night Watchman in the Hubli Branch of the Karnataka Bank Limited is justified ? If so, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled.

[No. L-12012(12)/82-D.IV.A]

New Delhi, the 20th January, 1983

S.O. 788.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 2, Bombay in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Narendra and Company, Bombay and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 11th January, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2, BOMBAY

Reference No. CGIT-2/25 of 1982

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of M/s. Narendra and Company, Bombay,

AND

Their Workmen.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employer—Shri G. D. Samant, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri S. R. Wagh, Advocate.

STATE : Maharashtra INDUSTRY : Port and Dock

Bombay, the 22nd December, 1982

AWARD

By the order No. L-31012/1/82-D.IV(A), dated 12-4-1982 following dispute was referred for adjudication which matter was fixed for hearing today after framing issues.

“Whether the action of the management of Messrs Narendra and Company Clearing Agents, Bombay, in terminating the services of Shri Hiranman M. Geythe, Dock Clerk, with effect from 8th September, 1981, is justified ? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled ?”

However, both the parties by their joint precipi (Ex-9) have informed that the dispute has been settled out of Tribunal amicably and it no longer survives.

Hence the reference disposed of.

M. A. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer

[No. L-31012/1/82-D.IV(A)]

S.O. 789.—In pursuance of section 17 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 1, Bombay, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bombay Port Trust, Bombay, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 11th January, 1983.

BEFORE THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT BOMBAY

Reference No. CGIT-5 of 1982

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to Bombay Port Trust, Bombay

AND

Their Workmen.

APPEARANCES :

For the employers—Mr. H. P. Sarkar, Dy. Legal Adviser

For B.P.T. General Workers Union—Mr. P. V. Datar, Secretary.

STATE : Maharashtra INDUSTRY : Ports & Docks
Bombay, the 24th December, 1982

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, by order No. L-31011(2)/82-D.II(A) dated 1st August, 1982, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred to this Tribunal for adjudication an industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bombay Port Trust, Bombay, and their workman in respect of the matters specified in the schedule mentioned below :—

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Bombay Port Trust in dismissing Shri M. Krishna Mallo Phondekar Scavenger of Docks Department, with effect from 25-2-1981 is justified ? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled ?”

2. The workman, K. M. Phondekar, was appointed as a Scavenger in the Docks Department of the Bombay Port Trust (for short “BPT”) on 1-10-1979. It is alleged on behalf of the management that on 5-12-1974 at about 5.00 p.m. the workman was caught red-handed by police constable, R. V. Pawar (No. 3300/I) near Yellow Gate, Princess Dock when he was found in possession of five small card board boxes hidden under his bush shirt and pant. A search of his person was taken in the presence of panchas by the police. Each box was found to contain two bundles of files wrapped in brown paper and each bundle contained six files. It was thus alleged that the workman committed the misconduct of theft in connection with the property lying in the custody of BPT which act was in contravention of Rule 22(2)(b) and (h) of the BPT rules and regulations for non-scheduled staff. This was the first charge framed against the workman in the departmental Inquiry held against him. It was also alleged that at the time of his arrest i.e. at about 5.00 p.m. on 5-12-1974 the workman was not on duty, but still he had entered into the Docks area with a dishonest intention. He, therefore, committed the misconduct of dishonesty in connection with the BPT property and he thereby also committed an act, subversive of discipline under Rule

22(2)(b) of the BPT rules and regulations for non-scheduled staff. In respect of this later allegation charge No. 2 was framed against the workman in the departmental inquiry.

3. The police instituted a case against the workman under Section 124 of the Bombay Police Act, 1951, and the workman was suspended from duty with effect from 15-12-1974 by the Docks Manager. The Court of the Metropolitan Magistrate, Ballara Estate, however, acquitted the workman of the charge by giving benefit of doubt by its order dated 13-11-1975. The workman accordingly resumed duty on 15-11-1975. He was thereafter chargesheeted in the departmental inquiry held against him on the two charges specified above. The workman denied the charges. The evidence was, therefore, recorded in the departmental inquiry. Mr. H. P. Sarkar, Asstt. Legal Adviser was appointed as the Inquiry Officer. In the departmental inquiry the management examined three witnesses viz., (i) D. A. Dhuri, Sub-Inspector of Police, (ii) Sayed Mohd. Sudik Gulam Mohyeddin Clerk Grade I, Docks and (iii) Bappoo Vithoba Pawar, Head Constable. On the basis of the evidence adduced against the workman in the said departmental inquiry, the Inquiry Officer held that the two charges framed against the workman were established. The Docks Manager accepted the findings of the Inquiry Officer and taking the view that the misconduct committed by the workman was of grave and serious nature, imposed the penalty of dismissal on the workman. The workman preferred an appeal against the dismissal order, but this appeal was rejected by the Chairman.

4. In the statement of claim filed by the B.P.T. General Workers' Union (hereinafter referred to as the "Union") which espoused the cause of this workman it was pleaded that the Inquiry Officer had held the charges proved even though there was no sufficient evidence to prove the same. Reliance was heavily placed upon the observations made by the learned Metropolitan Magistrate in his judgement acquitting the workman. The circumstances relied upon by the learned Magistrate to acquit the accused were referred to. It may be mentioned that he learned Magistrate had held in his judgement that the prosecution had failed to prove the case against the accused that the property was found in possession of the accused. It was stated in the statement of claim that the Inquiry Officer erred in ignoring the judicial decision of the Metropolitan Magistrate. It was further stated that the competent authority had not applied its mind while accepting the findings of the Inquiry Officer. It was, therefore, prayed that this Tribunal be pleased to hold that the action of the management in dismissing the workman was not justified and that he should be reinstated with back wages.

5. The Union has produced on record the judgement of the learned Magistrate acquitting the workman (exhibit U-1). The judgement was delivered on 13-11-1975. It must be conceded in favour of the management that in spite of the judgement of the Criminal Court it would be open for the management to proceed in a departmental inquiry against the workman and if the management could succeed in adducing satisfactory evidence to prove the charges, the workman could be found guilty, in spite of his acquittal in the criminal case. We have, therefore, to see whether the evidence adduced against the workman in the departmental inquiry was sufficient to establish the charges framed against him. It would appear from the narration of facts in the judgement of the Criminal Court that police constable, Pawar, P. C. No. 3300/J was at the material time i.e. on 5-12-1974 attached to Yellowgate Police Station. At about 5.00 P.M. when he was on duty at Yellow Gate, Princess Dock along with some Inspector Anpat he noticed the workman coming towards the Main Gate. On seeing this police constable the workman who had come towards the Main Gate, in order to go out, was frightened. The police constable, therefore, suspected the workman and detained him there for the purpose of taking the search. According to the narration of facts i.e. found in the judgement of the Criminal Court, B. V. Pawar then touched the belly of the accused and found that it was bulging. He reported the matter to Sub-Inspector Anpat, who in turn informed the Yellow Gate Police Officer and at about 5.45 P.M. Sub-Inspector Dhuri came there with a constable. Then two panchas were called and in the presence of the panchas, the workman was searched and in that search, five boxes, each containing dozen files were found concealed by the workman under his pant, below the shirt and the same were taken charge of under the pan-

chanama. The workman could not satisfactorily account for the possession of the same and, therefore, it was suspected to be the stolen property.

6. The learned Magistrate, inter alia, found the following infirmities in the prosecution evidence; (i) the workman was first detained at 5.00 P.M. No panchnama of search of his body was made upto 5.45 P.M. when P. S. I. Dhuri came on the spot P.S.I. Anpat who was present on the spot when the accused was first found could have drawn up the panchnama. The learned Magistrate found it doubtful that the workman will stand there in the same position with the property on his person till 5.45 P.M., without throwing that property from his person, (ii) panch witness Bhandekar did not support the prosecution case. He stated that the workman was not searched in his presence as mentioned in the panchnama and that the property produced in this case was lying on the table there. The panch witness stated that he had not seen the property on the person of the workman. The defence of the workman in the criminal case was that five card board boxes containing the files were not found on his person. They were lying by the side of the wall when he was sweeping near the Yellow Gate, Princess Dock between 4 and 4.30 P.M. At that time police constable, Pawar who was at the Main Gate of Yellow Gate arrested him and falsely involved him in his case. The learned Magistrate did not find this defence case to be convincing. Still considering the above infirmities in the prosecution evidence the learned Magistrate found that the prosecution had failed to prove the case against the workman and, therefore, no guilt was brought home to him.

7. Now, in the departmental inquiry the management examined police constable, Pawar and P.S.I. Dhuri. The evidence of these two witnesses was adduced to prove the charges against the workman. The third witness, Sayed Mohammad was examined to show that the duty hours of the workman on that day were upto 3.30 P.M. only and that he was not required to remain present in the Docks area thereafter. The inquiry began on 20-6-1978. On that day the workman did not admit the charges and stated that he wanted to defend himself. He stated that he may be allowed to be defended by one A. K. Pandaya of the B.P.T. General Works' Union. He was allowed to do so. No witness was examined by the management on that day.

8. On 18-7-1978 the management examined two witnesses viz., D.A. Dhuri and M.S.G. Sayed. On that day the workman made an application to the Inquiry Officer that the proceedings be adjourned as he wanted to change the man who was nominated by him for his defence. He stated that he wanted to engage one Mr. Dattar of the Union. The Inquiry Officer remarked that Mr. Dattar was not present before him at that time. He observed that if the workman had a mind to change his representative, his proposed representative should have been remained present in the inquiry. The inquiry Officer further observed that the workman wanted to linger the inquiry quite unnecessarily. The Inquiry Officer therefore rejected the request for adjournment. The management, therefore, examined the above two witnesses. The workman did not cross-examine them. The witnesses were discharged. The proceedings were then adjourned to 8-8-1978.

9. It appears that both sides made request for adjournment on that day for the reasons mentioned by them. The proceedings were, therefore, adjourned to 21-8-1978.

10. On 21-8-1978 police constable, Pawar was examined. Before he was examined, a request for adjournment was made on behalf of the workman by Mr. Dattar, whom the workman wanted to engage for defending himself. The request for adjournment was refused and police constable Pawar was examined. It appears that Mr. Dattar had left after the application for adjournment was rejected. Police constable, Pawar was not cross-examined by the workman. After the witnesses for the management were examined the workman's statement was recorded. He stated in that statement that he was on duty on that day upto 3.30 P.M. He further stated that he was arrested at 2.00 P.M. and not at 5.00 P.M. When questioned as to why the department's witnesses Pawar and P.S.I. Dhuri were giving false evidence against him the workman stated that he could not tell about it. The workman denied that any material was recovered from his person. He specifically denied that P.S.I. Dhuri had taken a search of his person.

11. None of the two panchas witnesses who were parties to the panchanama were examined by the management. It was stated that one of the pancha witnesses had gone hostile and another pancha witness could not be traced. PSI Anpat was not examined in the departmental proceedings. PSI Dhuri had stated in his statement that after he received a message from PSI Anpat, at about 5.00 P.M. he went to the spot where the workman was detained. He further stated that in the presence of two panchas he took a search of the workman and the material as alleged was found on his person. He made efforts to locate the place wherefrom the workman might have collected the material. But, he could not trace out any such place. He added that the workman could not give satisfactory reply as to wherefrom he had procured the material. He stated that such type of materials were lying in the Docks area for import and export purposes. Police constable, Pawar stated in his deposition that at about 5.00 P.M. the workman was coming towards Yellow Gate Dock for going out. His movements were suspicious. A portion of his belly appeared to be a little bit raised. He, therefore, draw the attention of PSI Anpat who also noticed that the workman's belly was raised. PSI Anpat, therefore, telephonically informed the Duty Officer at the Yellow Gate. After about half-an-hour Sub-Inspector Dhuri arrived at the Gate along with a police constable and two panchas and he took a search of the person of the workman in the presence of the two panchas and recovered the material from his person.

12. PSI Anpat is not examined in the inquiry. None of the two panchas has been examined. It is true that the management wanted to say that one of the panchas had gone hostile and the other pancha was not available. In order to make up the deficiency in the matter of adducing the evidence the management should have examined PSI Anpat. It is difficult to believe the version that the workman was allowed to stand with the material on his person till PSI Dhuri came on the spot after about 45 minutes. One of the panchas examined in the criminal case stated that nothing was recovered from the person of the workman in his presence. Mr. H. P. Sarkar, who incidently was the Inquiry Officer in this case appeared before me on behalf of the management. He stated that the department need not prove the charges beyond reasonable doubt, as is the requirement in a criminal case; were preponderance of probability is sufficient. Assuming that burden of proof is not so heavy as in the criminal case, still in a departmental inquiry also the management should adduce sufficient evidence to prove the charges. The charges in this case were serious, I am of the view that the evidence adduced by the management in the inquiry proceeding is not sufficient to establish the charges. Incidentally, it may be pointed out that charge no. 2 states that the workman entered into the Docks area with a dishonest intention. Admittedly, the workman was on duty on that day in the Docks area. There is no proof that the workman, after his duty hours were over, had gone out of the Docks area and again entered the Dock area. I find that there was no sufficient material to hold that the charges were proved. The action of the management of PBT, therefore, in dismissing the workman, K. M. Phondekar, was not justified. He will, therefore, be entitled to reinstatement.

13. Now, the question is about back wages. It cannot be said from the judgement of the Criminal Court that the workmen he was honourably acquitted. Even from the material in the departmental inquiry it cannot be said that the charges levelled against the workman were totally false. It is true that they have not been proved by sufficient evidence. Under the circumstances I am of the view that half the back wages would meet the ends of justice.

14. In the result, I find that the action of the B.P.T. in dismissing the workman, K. M. Phondekar was not justified. He is entitled to reinstatement with half the back wages and other consequential benefits.

15. My award accordingly. No order as to costs.

M. D. KAMBLI, Presiding Officer

[No. L-31011(2)/82-D. IV (A)]

S O. 790.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 2, Bombay, in the industrial dispute between the employees in relation to the management of Life Insurance Corporation of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 11th January, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL No. 2, BOMBAY

Reference No. CGIT-2/4 of 1982

PARTIES .

Employers in relation to the management of Life Insurance Corporation of India, Bombay

AND

Their Workmen.

APPEARANCES :

For the employer.—Shri P. R. Pai, Advocate.

For the Workman.—Shri U. N. Limaye, Advocate.

STATE : Maharashtra

INDUSTRY : Insurance

Bombay, the 21st December, 1982

AWARD

By their Order No. L-17012(4)/81-D. IV(A), dated 16-1-82 following dispute has been referred for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 on receipt of the failure report under Section 12(4) of the Act.

"Whether the management of Life Insurance Corporation of India in relation to its Bombay Office are justified in refusing the payment of officiating allowance to Shri G. P. Ahuja who had worked as officiating Section Head at Ulhasnagar Branch for the period from 24th December, 1974 to 13th December, 1977 ? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled ?"

2. Although the Reference relates to the period from 24-12-1974 to 13-12-1977 on the assumption that during this entire period the workman concerned performed the duties as a Section Head from the statement of claim paragraph 16 itself Ex. 3/W it is evident that the period to be counted for the said purpose is from 24-12-1974 to 13-2-1977 and not as stated in the order of Reference as 13-12-1977. The Reference, therefore, for any period subsequent to 13-2-1977 would not be sustainable and the period considered is from 24-12-1974 to 13-2-1977.

3. The contention of the Union as seen from statement of claim at Ex. 3/W, and by Union I mean insurance Employees Association, is that there is a branch of Life Insurance Corporation of India at Ulhasnagar bearing No. 915 which besides the Officers, comprises of 16 members of Class III and IV category consisting of one Section Head, two Higher grade Assistants, nine typists, one Cashier cum Receiving Clerk and three Peons. The present dispute relates to an Assistant belonging to Clerical Class III, by name Shri Ahuja. It is the contention of the Union that by an office order dated 24-12-1974 passed by the Branch Manager, Shri Ahuja in addition to his own work was authorised to sit at the cash counter, sign the receipts and also to sign the cash book. The Union also refers to the orders dated 19-2-1975, office order dated 12-3-1975, order dated 23-8-1975 and lastly the order dated 18-11-1976 whereby it is alleged that the various duties to be performed by the Section Head were conferred on Shri Ahuja but since no salary was mentioned nor any allowance, by a demand dated

13-1-1977 by the Union a demand in this connection was raised ultimately which culminated in the direction to the Branch Manager to relieve Shri Ahuja of all the responsibilities as a result of which by order dated 12-2-1977 to be effective from 14-2-1977 Shri Ahuja was relieved of the responsibilities and instead a Section Head by name Shri Y. S. Deshmukh was directed to perform these duties.

4. The net result of this subsequent event was a demand by the Union and its attempt to raise an industrial dispute. However, initially the Government by an order dated 30-4-1981 declined to make any Reference on the ground that the appointment was by the competent authority and that there was considerable delay in raising the dispute. However, subsequently the matter seems to have been reviewed by the Central Government as a result of which the present Reference saw the light of the day.

5. The matter has been contested by the Corporation who have filed the written statement Ex. 2/M whereby the Branch Manager's competency to pass relevant orders has been challenged and it is contended that under the Staff Regulation 1960 which admittedly have force of law, it is the Divisional Manager alone who could have appointed a Section Head and since the said authority did not pass any suitable orders, the demand raised by the Union for officiating allowance would not be tenable. It is further contended that since the duties performed by the workman concerned were the normal duties of an Assistant, in which grade he was already posted and not the duties of an Officiating Section Head, the demand for special allowance factually also cannot be entertained. Lastly it is urged that since there was no material before the Central Government at the time when order of Reference was made, they cannot be said to have applied their mind and therefore it renders the order of Reference itself bad.

6. On the above pleadings following issues arise for consideration : (Ex. 22).

ISSUES :	FINDINGS :
1. Whether the Union establishes that Shri G.P. Ahuja was appointed to work as Section Head ?	Not by Competent Authority but by Branch Manager.
2. Is it further established that he was required to perform the duties of the Officiating Section Head?	Yes
3. If yes, whether he is entitled to claim officiating allowance?	Yes
4. What relief?	As per award.

REASONS

7. The relevant two orders passed by the Central Government, first dated 30-4-1981 when the Central Government declined to refer the dispute and the second dated 10-8-1981 when the decision was reviewed and the dispute came to be referred under Section 10(1)(d) are produced by the Corporation themselves at Exhibits 6/M and 7/M respectively, the perusal of which orders would negate the stand of the Corporation that on the second occasion there was no application of mind by the Government rendering the Reference bad and therefore unsustainable. On the first occasion it was thought, as seen from Ex. 6/M, that the Branch Manager could not have passed relevant orders, he being not competent and it was further thought that there was considerable delay in advancing the claim and on these two counts the demand for Reference came to be turned down.

8. However, as seen from Ex. 7/M when the Government was convinced that law of limitation is not applicable and when it was further convinced that there was sufficient material to assure that the Assistant performed the duties of a Section Head, it was realised that what is important is not the designation but the terms of work done and therefore the Central Government reviewed its own order and decided

to make the Reference. This therefore can never be treated as a case of non-application of mind, but it is evidently a case where there was complete application of mind and the resultant arriving at a conclusion under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act. The order at Ex. 7/M is clearly a speaking order indicating why the review of the earlier order was necessary and, therefore, the objection in this regard raised by the Corporation is completely devoid of any force and as such as to be rejected.

9. What is then to be considered is whether the Assistant concerned in fact was required to perform the duties of an officiating Section Head and if answer to this issue is in the affirmative, what would be its effect on the defect or lacuna in passing these order not by a competent authority as required by the Regulation but by immediate superior viz. the Branch Manager. Since the factual data viz. whether in fact the duties were performed by the Assistant will have not only a direct bearing on issue No. 2 but also an indirect bearing on issue No. 1, on which the ultimate relief depends, the said point is taken initially.

10. By an office order dated 24-12-1974 copy at Ex. 8/W, Branch Manager in charge of Branch Office No. 915 viz. Ulhasnagar branch of the Corporation authorised Shri Ahuja to sit at the Cash counter and sign all the receipts and issues etc. on any day the situation demands. It is therefore evident that so far as this order is concerned, it was a sort of stop-gap arrangement to be enforced when the situation would demand. Here a mention may be made to the duties of an Assistant the extract of which has been brought by the Union at Ex. 18/W where it is laid down that Assistant may occasionally be required to do the work of a Cashier for which ordinarily a special allowance is paid. At the same time it is also made clear that such special allowance is to be paid only where the Assistant is required to do such work full time and no allowance would be paid where the Assistant is required to attend to such work occasionally on a casual leave vacancy or for short periods every day. On page 33 of the Regulation a special pay of Rs. 25 p.m. is payable to receiving and paying Cashiers and therefore when this Regulation is read in the light of the duties of an Assistant, merely because Shri Ahuja was directed to sit at the cash counter and to sign all receipts and Cash Book etc. on any day the situation demanded, would not automatically without evidence lead to an inference that from the said day onwards he started performing the duties full time and not occasionally and therefore the demand from 24-12-1974 would not be sustainable.

11. The next order is an office order dated 12-3-1975 whereby Shri Ahuja was directed to shoulder the overall responsibility of the Accounts Department vide Ex. 10/W which is also produced by the management at Ex. 5/M. Before that, by an order dated 19-2-1975 passed by the Senior Divisional Manager copy of which is on record at Ex. 9/W, the agent of the Punjab National Bank, Ulhasnagar in whose Bank the Corporation has current Account was requested to register the additional authority conferred on Shri Ahuja to operate the relevant account jointly by any of the two of the four person stated including Shri G. P. Ahuja. The other three authorities mentioned were the Assistant Branch Manager, Section Head and Shri Ahuja the Assistant. By the said order authority given to Shri Talreja the then Branch Manager was revoked and I am given to understand by Shri Deo on behalf of the Union that revocation was a result of retirement of Shri Talreja.

12. The order dated 19-2-1975 passed by Senior Divisional Manager above referred to was followed immediately by the order dated 12-3-1975 already referred to Ex. 10/W when Shri Ahuja was asked to shoulder the overall responsibility of the Accounts Department. The very order indicates that the Accounts Department consisted of two Assistants and the Cashier and when overall responsibility of the department was conferred on one of the Assistants, it means that the other incumbents serving in the same department were placed under him. An attempt was made on behalf of the Corporation that at no point of time Shri Ahuja was required to work as a Section Head but the order dated 12-3-1975 could be an answer to the said argument. From the said date atleast, Shri Ahuja cannot be said to be functioning as an Assistant only but besides his duties he was expected to supervise the work of other employees serving in the Accounts Department.

13. It would be convenient at this stage to refer to the duties of a Section Head the extract of which is at Ex. 18/W, which is an extract from Establishment Manual which is not denied and it is evident that the Section Head besides working as an Assistant shall be shouldering supervisory responsibilities, is required to supervise and check the work of Assistants placed under him and to give necessary guidance, is required to see that the Assistant, placed under him perform the duties regularly and attend the office punctually etc. Apart from whether the Branch Manager could have passed this order or not, the fact remains that from 13-3-1975 Shri Ahuja was directed to shoulder the overall responsibility of the Accounts department. At Ex. 9/W and 11/W the arrangement for operating the current Account are indicated, by an office order dated 23-8-1975 Ex. 12/W Shri Ahuja was placed in charge of key No. 2 but this was in the absence of the Branch Manager and though the order as such would have a permanent effect till it was revoked, it was not a continuous arrangement but an arrangement to be effective during the absence of the Branch Manager and the record is not clear about the period of absence of the Branch Manager during the relevant period. On 18-11-1976 by another office order copy of which is at Ex. 13/W the Branch Manager in addition to the overall responsibility of the Accounts department as per office order dated 12-3-1975 directed Shri Ahuja to check and initial entries in the Cash Pay Book, sign all premium receipts, cash books, deposit book and S.S.S. collection book etc.

14. However, on 20-1-1977 the Branch Manager was told by the Senior Divisional Manager, who as the record goes is the competent authority to revoke the arrangement regarding signing the receipts by Shri Ahuja and from the said time onwards the Section Head was asked to perform those duties. Similarly, by an office order dated 12-2-1977 Shri Ahuja was relieved of all his duties barring as an Assistant and officiating Section Head was asked to undertake that work vide Ex. 19/W. This order was to be effective from 14-2-1977 i.e. ending with the period dated 13-2-1977.

15. Before that however certain correspondence had passed between the Divisional Office and the Branch Manager whereby the Branch Manager was justifying his action of placing Shri Ahuja in overall responsibility of the Accounts department and virtually working as a Section Head. The copies of letter are 15/W, 16/W and 17/W are relevant copies for this purpose. By Ex. 15/W dated 15-1-1977 the Branch Manager reported to the Divisional Manager Accounts the work conferred on Shri Ahuja and further reported that the Senior Assistant in question shouldered the responsibility ably as a result of which the rating of the Accounts department which in the year 1974-75 was 'fair' was converted into 'very good' in the year 1975-76 and 1976-77. The Branch Manager also stated that officiating Section Head was posted in New Business Department due to shortage of staff. He requested to allow the arrangement till 31-3-1977 apprehending that for lack of proper supervision the working of the Accounts department would deteriorate. He further pointed out that Shri Ahuja was exempted from written test for the post of a Section Head and lastly requested that either the arrangement should be allowed to be continued or it should be regularised by promoting Shri Ahuja.

16. This letter was followed by another letter dated 27-1-1975 Ex. 16/W written by Assistant Divisional Manager Personnel to the Branch Manager asking for the copies of the orders issued to Shri Ahuja and the nature of work entrusted to him with special reference to the work ordinarily attended to by a Section Head. This was replied by the Branch Manager, by letter dated 1-2-1977 Ex. 17/W whereby after quoting the various duties entrusted to Shri Ahuja in last paragraph it was stated "in other words Shri G. P. Ahuja is not only discharging duties of an Assistant but also of a Section Head in Accounts department of the Branch". When it is contended by the Corporation that duties discharged by Shri Ahuja under the various orders were not the functions of a Section Head, the report by the Branch Manager Ex. 17/W will be a complete answer to the said contention and no other conclusion is possible than to hold that from the time Shri Ahuja was placed in overall responsibility of the Accounts department by the order dated 12-3-1975 i.e. from 13-3-1975 till he was relieved of the

said charge from 14-2-1977, Shri Ahuja, if not de jure, de facto at least was serving the Corporation as and discharging the functions of a Section Head.

17. Under Chapter-II of the Regulation, Regulation No. 8 speaks of the appointment, which shall be made by the authorities specified in Schedule-I and under clause (c) of Schedule-I the appointing authority for other employees is the Divisional Manager. Under Schedule-IV clause (17) when any appointment is to be made of an employee to officiate in a higher post, the authority competent to pass that order is the appointing authority. In the instant case admittedly the order were never given by the Divisional Manager but were passed by the Branch Manager, although the copies of the orders as seen from Ex. 13/W appear to have sent to the Divisional Office Accounts department and personnel department. Nevertheless the fact remains that the order dated 12-3-1975 or that dated 18-11-1976 were never by the competent authority or the appointing authority, but by the Branch Manager, meaning thereby that Shri Ahuja could have never been said to have been posted legally to work as a Section Head. At the same time the record in clear terms establishes that from 13-3-1975 till 13-2-1977 Shri Ahuja was placed in overall responsibility of Accounts department and if these duties are compared with the duties of a Section Head narrated in Ex. 18/W, only irresistible conclusion is that during the relevant period Shri Ahuja did discharge the functions of a Section Head.

18. My attention has been drawn to a judgement in Ref. CIT-8 of 1976 dated 30-9-1981 but only ratio which would be applicable to the facts of the present case is that because the order of appointment was not passed by the competent authority, the revocation could have been validly done by the Branch Manager and any such revocation could not have been challenged by the employee or the Union on his behalf. But the fact that despite there was no order by the competent authority, the employee discharged the functions of an Acting Section Head, still remains and it will have its own ramifications.

19. When Shri Ahuja discharged these functions, when he shouldered the overall responsibility to the best of his ability invoking a better remark, and thus improving the work of Accounts department, the Corporation will not be allowed to take shelter behind the absence of competent authority's order and will not be allowed to deny the special allowance payable to such an employee. In this connection Regulation 21 of the Corporation Staff Regulation enjoins upon the employee to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty and further expects that he shall observe, comply with and obey all orders and directions which may be given to him in the course of his official duties by any persons under whose jurisdiction, Superintendence or control he may for the time being be placed. It can never be denied that Shri Ahuja was employed under the Branch Manager and if therefore, the employee had ignored those orders passed by the Branch Manager under the pretext that they were not passed by the competent authority, there would have occurred the breach of Regulation 21 in Chapter III. The Corporation therefore cannot lay stress on the lacuna and at the same time placed that these Regulations have a force of law and therefore are binding on the employees. In my view therefore since Shri Ahuja is proved to have discharged the duties and functions of a Section Head during the period from 13-3-1975 to 13-2-1977, he shall be entitled to the special allowance.

20. On page 32 of the Regulation in category No. III clause (iii) we find a reference to Section Heads and it is stated that when any Assistant is promoted as a Section Head, besides his salary as an Assistant he shall be eligible to draw an additional allowance of Rs. 40 p.m. in the first 5 years of service as such. Having regard to this provision I hold that during the relevant period since he was not completing the period of 5 years Shri Ahuja is entitled to claim at the rate of Rs. 40 p.m. in the month of March, 1975 as well as in the month of February 1977 Shri Ahuja has not completed 30 working days but having regard to the totality of circumstances and having regard to the fact that Shri Ahuja worked completely to the satisfaction of the Branch

Manager, I hold that for these 2 months also he should get at the rate of Rs 40 p.m.

21. The very provision while dealing with receiving and paying Cashiers under clause (vi) page 32 speaks of the special pay of Rs. 25 p.m. but since as a Section Head Shri Ahuja is ordered to receive Rs. 40 p.m. which is in excess of Rs. 25 nothing extra is made payable.

22. It is already seen that Shri Ahuja was never appointed as Section Head, though he worked in the said capacity, the only effect of which could be that instead of special pay of Rs. 40 p.m. Shri Ahuja would be entitled to get officiating allowance of Rs. 40 p.m. during the relevant period. The result is that the Corporation is liable to pay Rs. 960 plus cost of this Award quantified at Rs 200. The amount shall be paid within one month from the date of publication of this award, otherwise it shall carry future interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum from the date of Reference till the time of payment.

Award accordingly.

M. A. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-17012(4)/81-D: IV(A)]

T. B. SITARAMAN, Desk Officer.

New Delhi, the 18th January, 1983

S.O. 791.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Sawang Colliery of Central Coalfields Limited, post office Sawang, District Giridih, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 14th January, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

Reference No. 102 of 1982

In the matter of an Industrial Disputes under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Swang Colliery of Central Coalfields Limited, Post Office Sawang, Distt. Giridih

AND

Their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the employers—Shri R. S. Murthy, Advocate.

On behalf of the workmen—Shri S. N. Singh, President Rashtriya Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, P.O. Sawang, Distt. : Giridih.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal

AWARD

This is an industrial dispute under Section 10 of the I.D. Act, 1947. The Central Government by its Order No. L-20012(153)/82-D.III(A) dated, the 14th September, 1982 has referred this dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication on the following terms :—

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Swang Colliery of Messrs Central Coalfields Limited, Post Office Sawang, District Giridih in punishing Shri R. P. Singh, Time Keeper by withholding his three increments is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?"

2. On receipt of the reference notices were sent to the parties for filing their written Statement. Accordingly the Union led their Written Statement and the employers wanted time to file settlement in this case. Time was accordingly granted to the parties for filing settlement. Ultimately on 4-1-83 the parties filed a settlement in terms of which only one increment was withheld instead of three increments in respect of Shri R. P. Singh, the concerned workman w.e.f. 1-4-82. Since the settlement is beneficial to the parties I accept the same and pass the Award accordingly. The settlement will form part of the Award as an Annexure.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2, DHANBAD

In the matter of reference No. 102 of 1982

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Sawang Colliery of Central Coalfields Ltd., P.O. Sawang, District Giridih,

AND

Their Workmen.

Joint petition for compromise settlement

The above mentioned employers as well as the workmen beg to submit as follows :—

(1) That both the management as well as the workmen have jointly discussed and negotiated the matter and have mutually agreed to come to an over all settlement of the matter following terms :—

(a) Agreed that the punishment awarded to the workman concerned Sri R. P. Singh, Time-Keeper, namely of withholding of his three annual increments with immediate effect vide office order No. SOM/E/41115 dated 29-12-81 will be deemed to have been modified to withholding of his one increment with effect from 1-3-82 to 31-3-82.

(b) Agree that the workmen concerned, Sri R. P. Singh will be given the withhold one increment in the time scale of the post held by him with effect from 1-4-82.

(c) That this is an overall agreement in full and final settlement of all the claims of the workmen concerned in this reference.

(2) That both the parties concerned considered the above agreement to be fair and reasonable to them.

In view of the above, both the employers as well as the workmen pray that the Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to accept the above compromise joint petition and give an award accordingly.

Sd/-

President,

Rashtriya Colliery

Mazdoor Sangh,

Dhanbad, the

4th January, 1983,

Sawang Branch, P.O. Sawang,

Distt. Giridih.

Sd/-

Deputy Chief Mining Engineer Sawang Group

Central Coalfields Limited,

P.O. Sawang, Dist. Giridih

For and on behalf

of the employers

Sd/-

R. S. Murthy, Advocate

For employers.

J. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer

[No. L-20012(153)/82-D.III(A)]

S.O. 792.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 3, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Karmik Bhawan, Saraidhela, District Dhanbad, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 14th January, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT NO. 3, DHANBAD

Reference No. 6/80

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Karmik Bhawan, Saraidhela, Dist. Dhanbad

AND

Their workmen.

APPEARANCES .

For the Employers—Shri S. S. Mukherjee, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri S. Bose, Secretary, R.C.M.S.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

STATE : Bihar.

Dated, the 4th January, 1983

AWARD

The Govt. of India in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them U/S 10(1)d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) has referred the dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication under Order No. L-20012/187/79-D.III(A) dated the 18th January, 1980.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the demand of the workmen of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Karmik Bhawan, Saraidhela, Dhanbad that Sarvashri Rajeswar Singh, R. S. Sharma, Gopaljee Singh, Stock Verifiers should be given the scale of pay and seniority from the 19th November, 1975 is justified? If so, to what relief are the said workmen entitled?”

2. The three workmen viz. Sarvashri Rajeswar Singh, R. S. Sharma and Gopaljee Singh were working on different posts in Area No. X and were in clerical Grade II. Their case is that sometime in the year 1975 the management wanted to recruit a number of Stock Verifiers in clerical Grade I and the vacancies were to be filled up through departmental promotions, accordingly a Committee was constituted for selecting suitable candidates from amongst the existing employees in clerical Grade II and a large number of candidates who had offered themselves for the promotion were interviewed. The three concerned workmen were also interviewed by the said Departmental Promotions Committee and were selected along with others as Stock Verifiers in Clerical Grade I and an office order to that effect was issued by the Personnel Directorate on 19-11-1975. The said office order was communicated to all the departments and Areas and they were intimated about the selection of the candidates concerned who were directed to report for their respective duty to the Chief Internal Auditor of B.C.E. Limited at Jealgora.

3. It is then stated that though the said office order was endorsed to Area No X also but reasons best known to the General Manager the concerned three workmen were not given release order and as such they could not report for duty to their new posts immediately. They approached the General Manager for their release order but it was refused. It is submitted that when the concerned workmen persisted for their release order they were transferred from Area Office to different collieries of Area No. X without assigning any reason. The concerned workmen approached the higher authorities and finally they were released by the General Manager with effect from 1-11-76 and they joined their new posts from that date.

4. It is also submitted that the delay in reporting to the new posts was caused by the illegal and arbitrary orders of the General Manager of Area No. X and the result was that the concerned workmen lost their pay as also seniority due to delay in joining their new posts. The concerned workmen represented before the management for arrears of wages and seniority but it was refused and then the present dispute was raised by them. The conciliation ended in failure, hence this Reference.

5. It is admitted by the management that prior to their promotion the concerned workmen were working in the Office of Area No. X in clerical Grade II. It is also admitted that on recommendation of the Departmental Promotions Committee the management decided to promote the concerned workmen to Grade I clerical scale and accordingly the office order was issued on 19-11-1975. It is, however, contended on behalf of the management that in the said office order it was clearly stipulated that the order will be effected from the date the concerned workmen would report for duty in their new place of posting. It is submitted that the said stipulation made the promotion a conditional and not absolute as claimed by the concerned workmen. It is stated that in terms of the said office order the concerned workmen reported for duty on 1-11-1976 and so in terms of the order dated 19-11-1975 they would be deemed to have been promoted with effect from the date of their joining viz. 1-11-76. It is also submitted that even assuming that the concerned workmen could not report to their new place of posting earlier because management of Area No. X could not release them earlier due to exigencies of work which not entitle the concerned workmen to claim promotion with effect from 19-11-1975 as the promotion was a conditional one and it was to take effect from the date of joining only.

6. On the above grounds it is prayed that the Reference be decided against the workmen.

7. The point for consideration is as to whether the demand of the workmen concerned that they should be given the scale of pay and seniority from 19-11-1975 is justified. If not to what relief they are entitled.

8. Ext. M-1 is the relevant office order issued by the management dated 19-11-1975. It says that the candidates mentioned therein were found suitable for promotion to the post of Stock Verifiers and they were accordingly promoted to the said post and were posted to Internal Audit Department, Jealgora. From this Order it will appear that as many as 17 candidates from different area and office of the B.C.C. Limited were promoted to the post of Stock Verifiers. It will also appear that the concerned workman Sri Rajeswar Singh is in Sl. No. 2, Sri R. S. Sharma in Sl. No. 10 and Sri Gopaljee Singh in Sl. No. 12. The Order, however, provides that they will serve a probationary period of one year and on being relieved by their respective Controlling Officers they were directed to report for duty to the Chief Internal Auditor, Jealgora. It further says that this Order will be effective from the date they report for duty to their new place of posting. Thus it is clear from this office order that the concerned workmen along with 14 others were promoted to the post of Stock Verifiers and were posted to Internal Audit Department, Jealgora. The simple case of the management is that as this order was to be effected from the date the candidates had reported for duty and hence as the concerned workmen joined on 1-11-1976 they will be deemed to have been promoted from 1-11-1976. According to the management even if the Controlling Officer did not release the concerned workmen still the concerned workmen cannot claim their scale and seniority with effect from 19-11-1975. The case of the concerned workmen, however, is that as per Ext. M-1 they were promoted from 19-11-1975 and the office order was sent to the Area concerned directing to release them and in spite of the requests of the concerned workmen they were not released by the General Manager Area No. X. Rather they were transferred to different departments even after their promotion and the delay in joining in the new place of posting was not due to their fault but it was due to the illegal act of the management and hence they should be given scale of pay and promotion as well as seniority from the date of issue of this Order.

9. The management, however, has not examined any witness in this case and has relied on the office order in question Ext. M-1. On behalf of the workmen, however, WW-1

has been examined who has stated that he and the other two concerned workmen were not released on receipt of the promotion order by the General Manager, Area No. X and hence there was delay in their joining for no fault of their own.

10. It is admitted that the concerned workmen were given promotion from the date of their joining and this has made them junior also. Exts. W-9 and W-10 are the seniority list which would show that concerned workmen have been made junior to others though in the promotion list they are in Sl. Nos. 2, 10 and 12 respectively. The question is as to whether the concerned workmen will suffer due to no fault of their own. From the documents on record it will appear that they were not released immediately and were released vide Ext. W-5 the release order dated 29-10-76. Exts. W-2 to W-4 would indicate that the names of the concerned workmen were sent for promotion before the Departmental Promotions Committee. Though the promotion order was issued on 19-11-75 but it will appear that instead of releasing the concerned workmen to join their new place of posting, they were transferred to different places vide order Exts. W-6 and W-7 dated 15-12-75 and 17-1-76. It appears that the concerned workmen requested the General Manager to release them as soon as their promotion order came. Ext. W-8 is the letter dated 24-12-75 sent by the General Manager to the concerned workmen Shri R. S. Sharma and Sri Gopaljee Singh in reply to their representation dated 3-12-75 in which they were informed that in view of the acute shortage in the Area it was not possible to release them immediately. The representations of the three concerned workmen were also rejected by another letter Ext. W-9 dated 30-12-76. They made another representation (Ext. W-1) on 23-8-78 for arrears of wages, increment and seniority but it was also refused. Now even if it be conceded that due to exigencies of work in that Area it was not possible for the General Manager of Area No. X to release the concerned workmen immediately still the concerned workmen should have been paid their scale of pay of clerical Grade I since the date of their order of promotion and their promotions should not be deemed to have been from the date of their joining. Further it is not denied that these concerned workmen were also made juniors for no fault of their own. It is common principle of law that seniority list is maintained according to the list prepared by the authority giving promotion to any candidate. The office order promoting the concerned workmen would show that they are in that list in Sl. Nos. 2, 10 and 12 and the same seniority list should have been maintained by the management and they should not have been made junior because the delay in joining their duty was due to the action of the management and not of the concerned workmen. There is absolutely no reason why the concerned workmen will suffer for no fault of their own.

11. Considering the documents and evidence on record, hold that the demand of the concerned workmen that they should be given scale of pay and seniority from 19-11-1975 is fully justified. Consequently the concerned workmen are entitled to receive their scale of pay of clerical Grade I from 19-11-1975 and they are also entitled to get their seniority as per order of promotion Ext. M-1 viz. they should be at Sl. No. 2, 10 and 12 as mentioned in the above list of promotion.

12. I give my award accordingly.

J. N. SINGH, Presiding Officer
[No. L-20012(187)/79-D.III(A)]

S.O. 793.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 1, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Govindpur Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Sonardih, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 14th January, 1983.

1235 GL 62--5

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under Sec. 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947
Reference No. 64 of 1981

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Govindpur Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., P.O. Sonardih, District Dhanbad.

AND

Their Workmen

APPEARANCES:

For the Employers—Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri S. Bose, Secretary, R.C.M.S., Dhanbad.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dhanbad, the 10th January, 1983

AWARD

The present reference arises out of Order No. L-20012 (244)/81-D.III(A), dated, the 7th November, 1981, passed by the Central Government in respect of an industrial dispute between the parties mentioned above. The subject matter of the dispute has been specified in the schedule to the said order and the said schedule runs as follows:

"Whether the action of the management of Govindpur Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Sonardih, District Dhanbad in not providing employment to Shri Rameshwar Chamar, Miner from February, 1975 is justified? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?"

2. The dispute has been settled out of Court. A memorandum of settlement has been filed in Court. I have gone through the terms of settlement and I find them quite fair and reasonable. There is no reason why an award should not be made on the terms and conditions laid down in the memorandum of settlement. I accept and make an award accordingly. The memorandum of settlement shall form part of the award.

3. Let a copy of this award be sent to the Ministry as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MANORANJAN PRASAD, Presiding Officer

[No. L-20012/244/81 D.III(A)]

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, AT DHANBAD

Reference No. 64 of 1981

PARTIES:

The Management of Govindpur Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., P.O. Sonardih District, Dhanbad.

AND

Their workman—Rameshwar Chamar.

The humble petition on behalf of the parties above named post respectfully sheweth:—

1. That the Central Government by notification No. L-20012(244)/81-D.III(A) dated 7th November, 1981 has been pleased to refer the dispute for adjudication on the issue con-

tained in the schedule of reference which is reproduced below :—

THE SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Govindpur Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, P.O. Sonardih, District Dhanbad is not providing employment to Shri Rameshwar Chamar, miner from February, 1975 is justified? If not to what relief is the said workman entitled?"

2. That without prejudice to the respective contentions of the parties, they have amicably settled the dispute on the following terms :—

Terms of settlement

(a) That Shri Rameshwar Chamar, miner of Govindpur Colliery will be re-instated with immediate effect as miner at Govindpur Colliery with continuity of service.

(b) That the intervening period from February 1975 till the date of resumption of duty will be treated as dies-non and Shri Rameshwar Chamar will not have any claim for wages for the intervening period referred above.

(c) That in case the concerned workman fails to resume his duty within 15 days from the date of settlement he will lose his right for re-instatement.

3 That it is submitted that the terms of the settlement are fair and proper.

4 That in view of the above settlement there exists no dispute to be adjudicated.

Under the facts and circumstances stated above it is humbly prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal will be graciously pleased to pass the Award in terms of the settlement.

Signature of the Union's representative.	Signature of the management representative of Govindpur Colliery.
---	---

1.	1.
2.	2.

Witnesses

1.
2.

Part of the Award

S.O. 794.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Godhur Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Kusunda, Dhanbad, and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on the 14th January, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD.

PRESENT :

Reference No. 78 of 1981

In the matter of an Industrial Disputes under Section 10 (1)(d) of the I.D. Act., 1947.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Godhur Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Kusunda, Dist. Dhanbad and their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the employers.—Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

On behalf of the workmen.—Shri S. Bose, Secretary, R.C.M.S., Dhanbad,

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal,

Dhanbad, the 11th January, 1983

AWARD

This is an industrial dispute under Section 10 of the I.D. Act, 1947. The Central Government by its Order No. L-20012/278/81-D III(A) dated the 14th December, 1981 has referred this dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication on the following terms :—

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Godhur Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Kusunda, District Dhanbad, in engaging Sarvashri Badal Ash, Sarju Rewani, Ram N Prasad, Mahabir Singh, Budhi Gope and Laldhari Rewani as Water Carriers/Mazdoors and making payments on vouchers and thereafter in stopping them from duty with effect from the 7th/23rd October 1980, was justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?"

2. On receipt of the Reference notices were duly sent to the parties for filing their Written Statement. The parties accordingly filed their Written Statement. Thereafter dates were fixed for filing rejoinder and documents. Ultimately on 7-1-83 the parties filed a memorandum of settlement in terms of which the concerned workmen will be made permanent on completion 190 days attendance in their respective posts. The concerned workmen as per the settlement will have to report in their respective posts within one month from the date of the settlement. Since the settlement is for the benefit of both the parties I accept the same and pass the Award in terms of the settlement. The settlement will form a part of the Award as an Annexure.

J. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer
[No. L-20012(278)/81-D III(A)]

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT.
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2 AT DHANBAD.

Reference No. 78 of 1981

Employers in relation to the management of Godhur Colliery.

AND

Their workmen

Petition of compromise

The humble petition on behalf of the parties above named most respectfully sheweth :—

1. That without prejudice to the respective contentions of the parties contained in their written statement, the parties

above named have settled this dispute on the following terms :—

Terms of the settlement

- (a) That the concerned persons namely S/Sri Badal Ash, Mahabir Singh, Budhi Gope, and Sarju Rewani, Ram N. Prasad and Lal Dhari Rewani will be given employment as Badli Miners/Loaders and will be made permanent as soon as they will complete 190 days of attendance in that capacity in a calendar year.
- (b) That the concerned persons will report for duties within one month's time from the date of this settlement.
- (c) That the dispute of employer-employee relationship for the past period will stand to be withdrawn and the concerned persons will not claim for past service or for backwages. They will be treated as fresh employees from the date of joining their duties.

2. That in view of this settlement, there remains nothing to be adjudicated.

Under the facts and circumstances stated above, the Hon'ble Tribunal will be graciously pleased to hold the settlement as fair and proper and will be pleased to pass the award in terms of the settlement.

For the Workmen

1. (Badal Ash)
2. (Sarju Rewani)
3. (Mahabir Singh)
4. (Budhi Gope)
5. (Laldhari Rewani)

For the employer.

- (M. Prasad)
- Agent
- Kusunda Area.
- (S. N. Sinha)
- Personnel Manager
- Kusunda Area

Verification

As the concerned persons have fully understood the contents of the terms of settlement and fully agree to abide by the same on our own volition for our own interest.

1. Shri Badal Ash.
2. Sri Sarju Rewani.
3. Shri Mahabir Singh.
4. Shri Budhi Gope.
5. Sri Laldhari Rewani.

New Delhi, the 20th January, 1983

S.O. 795.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 1, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bhagaband area No. VII of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Kusunda District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 18th January, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under Sec. 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Reference No. 44 of 1981

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Bhagaband Area No. VII of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Kusunda, Dist. Dhanbad.

AND

Their Workmen

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri B. Jeshi, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri J. D. Lal, Secretary, Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dhanbad, the 13th January, 1983

AWARD

The present reference arises out of Order No. L-20012(117)/81-D.III(A), dated the 28th July, 1981 passed by the Central Government in respect of an industrial dispute between the parties mentioned above. The subject matter of the dispute has been specified in the schedule to the said order and the said schedule runs as follows :

“Whether the demand of the workmen of Alkusa Colliery in Bhagaband Area No. VII of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Kusunda, District Dhanbad, that Shri G. N. Tiwari, Assistant Cashier in Clerical Grade II should be promoted to the post of Clerical Grade I with effect from the 30th June, 1977, is justified ? If so, to what relief is the said workman entitled ?”

2. The dispute has been settled out of court. A memorandum of settlement dated 13-1-1983 has been filed in court. I have gone through the terms of settlement and I find them quite fair and reasonable. There is no reason why an award should not be made on the terms and conditions laid down in the memorandum of settlement. I accept it and make an award accordingly. The memorandum of settlement shall form part of the award.

3. Let a copy of this award be sent to the Ministry as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Sd/-

MANORANJAN, PRASAD, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-20012/117/81-D.III(A)]

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1 AT DHANBAD

Reference No. 44/81

Employers in relation to the management of Alkusa Colliery

AND

Their workman

Petition of compromise

The humble petitioner on behalf of the parties above named most respectfully submit that :—

1. That without prejudice to the respective contentions of the parties contained in their written statement, the parties have settled the dispute on the following terms :—

Terms of Settlement

- (a) That the concerned workman does not have any grievance against the management as he has already been promoted to Grade-I Clerk with effect from 1-5-82.
- (b) That the management agrees to correct his seniority in Grade-I with effect from 29-6-77 and his name should be entered in the seniority list of Gr-I Clerk of Bhaga and Area considering his seniority in Gr-I from 29-6-77.

- (c) That the concerned workman will not claim any difference of Wages on incidental benefits between Grade-I and Grade-II for the period from 29-6-77 to 1-5-82.

2. That in view of this settlement there remain nothing to be adjudicated.

Under the facts and circumstances stated above the Hon'ble Tribunal may be graciously pleased to hold the terms of the settlement as fair and proper and be pleased to pass the Award in terms of the settlement.

For the workmen

For the Employers

1.

1. GM/Agent, Alkusa Colliery.

2. (J. D. Lall)

2. Personnel Manager.

Declaration

I, Sri G. N. Tiwari, the concerned workman do hereby declare that I have carefully gone through the contents of the terms of the settlement and I fully accept the same on my volitions without pressers from any side.

GORAKH NATH TIWARY, Asstt. Cashier

Signature of the concerned workman

[No. L-20012/117/81-D.III(A)]

S.O. 796.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 1, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Noonodih Jitpur Colliery of Messrs Indian Iron and Steel Company Limited, Post Office Bhaga, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 18th January, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO 1, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under Sec 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Reference No. 38 of 1981

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Noonodih Jitpur Colliery of Messrs Indian Iron and Steel Company Limited, Post Office Bhaga, District Dhanbad.

AND

Their Workmen

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri T. P. Choudhury, Advocate.

For the Workmen—None.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal

Dhanbad, the 12th January, 1983

AWARD

By Order No. L-20012/4/81-D.III(A), dated, the 2nd July, 1981, the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

"Whether the action of the management of Noonodih Jitpur Colliery of Messrs Indian Iron and Steel Com-

pany Limited, Post Office Bhaga, District Dhanbad in giving Category-I to Salvashi (1) Ruplal, (2) Durga, (3) Sofia Kamin, (4) Bhadi Kamin, (5) Jiwan, (6) Lulha Dome, (7) Manu Kamin, (8) Hani Charan, (9), Raghunath and (10) Chiku, all Sweepers, is justified? If not, to what relief are the concerned workmen entitled?"

2. The management and the workmen have filed their respective written statements. A rejoinder has also been filed by the management. But no rejoinder has been filed by the workman.

3. The case of the management is that Noonodih Jitpur Colliery has about 850 quarters for miners/staff and officers and since this is an old mine, most of the quarters were provided with service latrines. Under a scheme introduced by the management to do away with the service latrines, most of the quarters have since been provided with septic latrines and now there are only a few quarters where service latrines are yet to be converted into septic latrines. The process of conversion of service latrines into septic latrines is, however, on the job being done in phases. Because of the conversion of most of the service latrines into septic latrines, out of 10 concerned workmen, only four, namely, Ruplal, Durga, Sofia Kamin and Bhadi Kamin, are required and employed in the job of removal of night soil and the remaining six are not employed in removal of night soil and they are working simply as sweeping mazdoors. The management has already recently upgraded the above named four concerned workmen, namely, Ruplal, Durga, Sofia Kamin and Bhadi Kamin, who are engaged in removal of night soil, from Category-I to Category-II, and the remaining six concerned workmen, who are not engaged in removal of night soil and who are simply working as sweeping mazdoors have been placed in Category-I, and they are being paid accordingly as per job descriptions laid down not only in Central Coal Wage Board Recommendations but also by N.C.W.A. I & II. The contention of the management, therefore, is that the four concerned workmen, namely, Ruplal, Durga, Sofia Kamin and Bhadi Kamin, have already been given Category-II by the management, and the action of the management in giving Category-I to the remaining six concerned workmen is fully justified.

4. The case of the concerned workmen, however, is that the sweepers job being the most unhygienic, in all fairness they ought to be given a category higher than Category-I or II in order to enable them to maintain their health by taking nutritious diet. It is also their case that while other sweepers employed in the same colliery are being paid Category-II wages or higher wages the same is being denied to them and thus they have been discriminated.

5. On 18-2-82 the management had examined one witness, namely, Rupendra Mohan (MW-1), Asstt. Manager (Personnel) of Jitpur Colliery, and he was also cross-examined by Mr. B. K. Lath, Advocate, appearing on behalf of the workmen. Subsequently, however, Mr. B. K. Lath ceased to appear in this case on behalf of the workmen and on 5-1-1983 when the case was taken up for further hearing no one appeared on behalf of the workmen though Mr. T. P. Choudhury, Advocate, was present on behalf of the management who examined Dwarika Mishra, Asstt. Sanitary Inspector of Jitpur Colliery as MW-2 and through him also got proved two documents which were marked as Extra M-1 and M-2. Since, however, there was none to cross-examine Dwarika Mishra on behalf of the workmen he was discharged and arguments of Mr. Choudhury on behalf of the management were heard in full and the award was reserved.

6. The management has examined Rupendra Mohan (MW-1) Asstt. Manager (Personnel) and Dwarika Mishra (MW-2). Asstt. Sanitary Inspector of Jitpur Colliery in support of its case that there are about 350 quarters in Jitpur Colliery for the members of the staff which were formerly provided with service latrines but most of them have since been converted into septic latrines. According to Dwarika Mishra (MW-2) when about 100 service latrines were still left to be converted into septic latrines about two years ago, the management had employed 4 sweepers, namely, Ruplal, Durga, Sofia Kamin and Bhadi Kamin, for removal of night soil from those about 100 service latrines, but since then most of those 100 service latrines have also been converted into

septic latrines and since last 5 to 6 months there are only 22 or 23 service latrines left which still remain to be converted into septic latrines, and now out of the above named four sweepers only Ruplal and Sofia Kamin are employed in removal of night soil of these 22 or 23 service latrines, and Durga and Bhadi Kamin are no longer regularly employed in removal of night soil though Durga is, at times, employed for doing that work when Ruplal and Sofia get rest, but still all the four have been given Category-II and are being paid accordingly with effect from 21-7-81, and the rest of the concerned workmen, who are employed only in cleaning drains and sweeping roads, have been given Category-I. The management has also got proved and marked an attested copy of the Establishment Slip for the month of July 1981 (Ext. M-1) and Workmen's Pay Slip of Jitpur Colliery (Ext. M-2) showing that Ruplal, Durga, Sofia Kamin and Bhadi Kamin have been given Category-II instead of Category-I with effect from 21-7-81 and are being paid higher basic wages accordingly.

7. From Item No. 19 of Category-I of Appendix V at page 42 of the Central Wage Board Recommendations—Vol-II, it would appear that a sweeping mazdoor who is generally employed on the surface to keep the surface area including screening and washing plants free from paper, dirt etc. and who may be employed under Medical Officer to keep the area round the colliery dhowrahs and colliery drains in good order, is to be given Category-I, whereas under Item No. 5 of Category-II of the same Appendix V at page 43, a sweeper who in addition to the duties of a sweeper mazdoor is also employed in removing night soil is to be given Category-II.

8. From the aforesaid evidence adduced by the management, which is uncontroverted, the workmen having led no evidence to the contrary, it is manifest that out of ten concerned workmen only four, namely, Ruplal, Durga, Sofia Kamin and Bhadi Kamin are employed by the management in the work of removal of night soil from a small number of existing service latrines, and hence they only can be termed to be sweepers and can claim to be entitled to Category-II, but the remaining six concerned workmen who are not employed in the job of removal of night soil and who are employed only in cleaning drains and sweeping the roads and premises of the colliery are only sweeping mazdoor and are entitled only to Category-I. This is what the management has already done by giving the aforesaid four sweepers, namely, Ruplal, Durga, Sofia Kamin and Bhadi Kamin Category-II with effect from 21-7-81 to whom they are also paying accordingly, leaving the remaining six concerned workmen in Category-I. Ruplal, Durga, Sofia Kamin and Bhadi Kamin having been already given Category-II by the management with effect from 21-7-81, the action of the management in giving Category-I to the remaining six concerned workmen, namely, Tiwan, Lulha Dome Mann Kamin Jhari Charan Raghunath and Chalku is held to be justified. The reference is answered and the award is made accordingly. In the circumstance, there will be no order as to costs.

MANORANJAN PRASAD, Presiding Officer.

[No. I-20012/4/81-D.III(A)]

A. V. S. SARMA, Desk Officer.

अवधि

नई दिल्ली, 16 नवम्बर, 1982

का० आ० 797.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उदाहरण अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में जयपुर नगर आंचलिक ग्रामीण बैंक, जयपुर के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है।

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7 के और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ब) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है, जिसके पठिसीन अधिकारी श्री रामराजलाल गुप्ता होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय जयपुर में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

जयपुर नगर आंचलिक ग्रामीण बैंक के श्रमिकों की लिपिकों कनिष्ठ लिपिकों तथा क्षेत्रीय सहायक की परिवर्धन अवधि को छः मास नियत करने (ख) 25 रुपये की रोकड़ भत्ते, 20 रुपये के साहसिक भत्ते तथा श्रमिकों में कार्य करने के लिए वेतन के 20 प्रतिशत पर स्थानापन्न भत्ते का संवायकरने (ग) 1500 किलोमीटर की सीमा तक दौरे कार्य में एक बार छुट्टी निकराया रियायत मंजूरी करने का मांगे न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुसूचि के हकदार हैं।

[सं० एल-12011/77/81-डी II (ए)]

ए० के० मोहामंडल डेस्क अधिकारी

ORDER

New Delhi, the 16th November, 1982

S.O. 797.—Whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Jaipur Nagpur Aanchlik Gramin Bank, Jaipur and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the schedule hereto annexed;

And where the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri Ram Raj Lal Gupta shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Jaipur and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the demands of workmen of of the Jaipur Nagpur Aanchlik, Gramin Bank, Jaipur for (a) fixation of the probationary period of Clerks, Junior Clerks and Field Assistants as six months, (b) payment of cash allowance of Rs. 25, cycle allowance of Rs. 20 and officiating allowance at 20 per cent of pay for working in higher grades, (c) grant of leave fare concession once in two years up to the limit of 1500 Kms of travel are justified? If so, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled?"

[No. L-12011/77/81-D.II(A)]

A. K. SAHA MANDAL, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली 10 दिसम्बर, 1982

का० आ० 793.—मैसर्स शिवालिक अग्रो-मॉर्ल प्राइवेट्स लिमिटेड, प्लॉट नं० 1, सेक्टर 3 इण्डस्ट्रियल एरिया, परधानू (हिमाचल प्रदेश) 173220 जिला सोलन (पी० एन० /6854) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त स्थापन कहा गया

है) ने कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम 1952 (1952 का 19) जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 17 की उपधारा (2क) के अधीन छूट दिए जाने के लिए आवेदन किया है।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त स्थापन के कर्मचारी, किसी पृथक् अभिदाय या प्रीमियम का सन्दाय किए बिना ही, भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम की सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन जीवन बीमा के रूप में फायदे उठा रहे हैं और ऐसे कर्मचारियों के लिए ये फायदे उन फायदों से अधिक अनुकूल हैं जो कर्मचारी निक्षेप सहबद्ध बीमा स्कीम, 1976 (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त स्कीम कहा गया है) के अधीन उन्हें अनुमेय हैं;

अतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उपधारा (2क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और इससे उभावद्ध अनुसूचों में विनिर्दिष्ट शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए, उक्त स्थापन को तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए उक्त स्कीम के सभी उपबन्धों के प्रवर्तन से छूट देती है।

अनुसूची

1. उक्त स्थापन के संबंध में नियोजक प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त पंजाब को ऐसी विवरणियां भेजेगा और ऐसे लेखा रखेगा तथा निरीक्षण के लिए ऐसी सुविधाएं प्रदान करेगा जो केन्द्रीय सरकार, समय समय पर निर्दिष्ट करें।

2. नियोजक, ऐसे निरीक्षण प्रभारों का प्रत्येक मास की समाप्ति के 15 दिन के भीतर सन्दाय करेगा जो केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उपधारा (3क) के खण्ड (क) के अधीन समय-समय पर निर्दिष्ट करें।

3. सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के प्रशासन में, जिसके अन्तर्गत लेखाओं का रखा जाना, विवरणियों का प्रस्तुत किया जाना बीमा प्रीमियम का सन्दाय, लेखाओं का अन्तरण, निरीक्षण प्रभारों का सन्दाय आदि भी है, होने वाले सभी व्ययों का बहू निर्योजक द्वारा किया जाएगा।

4. नियोजक, केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा यथा अनुमोदित सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के नियमों की एक प्रति, और जब कभी उनमें संशोधन किया जाए, तब उस संशोधन की प्रति तथा कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या की भाषा में उसकी मुख्य बातों का अनुवाद, स्थापन के सूचना-पट्ट पर प्रदर्शित करेगा।

5. यदि कोई ऐसा कर्मचारी, जो कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि का या उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन छूट प्राप्त किसी स्थापन की भविष्य निधि का पहले ही सदस्य है, उसके स्थापन में नियोजित किया जाता है तो, नियोजक सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के सदस्य के रूप में उसका नाम तुरन्त दर्ज करेगा और उसकी बाबत आवश्यक प्रीमियम भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम को सन्दाय करेगा।

6. यदि उक्त स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को उपलब्ध फायदे बढ़ाए जाते हैं तो, नियोजक सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को उपलब्ध फायदों में समुचित रूप से

वृद्धि की जाने की व्यवस्था करेगा, जिससे कि कर्मचारियों के लिए सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन उपलब्ध फायदे उन फायदों से अधिक अनुकूल हों, जो उक्त स्कीम के अधीन अनुमेय है।

7. सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम में किसी बात के होते हुए भी, यदि किसी कर्मचारी की मृत्यु पर इस स्कीम के अधीन संदेय रकम उस रकम से कम है, जो कर्मचारी को उस दशा में संदेय होती, जब वह उक्त स्कीम के अधीन होता तो, नियोजक कर्मचारी के विधिक वारिस/नाम निर्देशिती को प्रतिकर के रूप में दोनों रकमों के अन्तर के बराबर रकम का संदाय करेगा।

8. सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के उपबन्धों में कोई भी संशोधन, प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त पंजाब के पूर्व अनुमोदन के बिना नहीं किया जायेगा और जहां किसी संशोधन के कर्मचारियों के हित पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना हो वहां, प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त, अपना अनुमोदन देने से पूर्व कर्मचारियों को अपना दृष्टिकोण स्पष्ट करने का युक्तियुक्त अवसर देगा।

9. यदि किसी कारणवश, स्थापन के कर्मचारी, भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम की उस सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के, जिसे स्थापन पहले जपना चुका है अधीन नहीं रह जाते हैं, या इस स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को प्राप्त होने वाले फायदे किसी रीति से कम हो जाते हैं, तो यह छूट रद्द की जा सकती है।

10. यदि किसी कारणवश, नियोजक उस नियत तारीख के भीतर, जो भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम नियत करें, प्रीमियम का संदाय करने में असफल रहता है, और पालिसी को व्यपगत हो जाने दिया जाता है तो, छूट रद्द की जा सकती है।

11. नियोजक द्वारा प्रीमियम के संदाय में किए गए किसी व्यतिक्रम की दशा में उन मृत सदस्यों के नाम निर्देशितियों या विधिक वारिसों को जो यदि यह, छूट न हो गई होती तो उक्त स्कीम के अन्तर्गत होते, बीमा फायदों के संदाय का उत्तरदायित्व नियोजक पर होगा।

12. उक्त स्थापन के संबंध में नियोजक, इस स्कीम के अधीन आने वाले किसी सदस्य की मृत्यु होने पर उसके हकदार नाम निर्देशितियों/विधिक वारिसों को बीमाकृत रकम का संदाय तत्परता से और प्रत्येक दशा में भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम से बीमाकृत रकम प्राप्त होने के सात दिन के भीतर सुनिश्चित करेगा।

।[संख्या एस-35014/424/82-पी० एफ०-2]

New Delhi, the 10th December, 1982

S.O. 798.—Whereas Messrs Shivalik Agro-Poly Products Limited, Plot No. 1, Sector III Industrial Area, Parwanoo (H.P.) 173220 District Solan, (PN/6854) (hereinafter referred to as the said establishment) have applied for exemption

under sub-section (2A) of section 17 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act);

And whereas, the Central Government is satisfied that the employees of the said establishment are, without making any separate contribution or payment of premium, in enjoyment of benefits under the Group Insurance Scheme of the Life Insurance Corporation of India in the nature of Life Insurance which are more favourable to such employees than the benefits admissible under the Employees Deposit-Linked Insurance Scheme, 1976 (hereinafter referred to as the said Scheme);

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2A) of section 17 of the said Act and subject to the conditions specified in the Schedule annexed hereto, the Central Government hereby exempts the said establishment from the operation of all the provisions of the said Scheme for a period of three years.

SCHEDULE

1. The employer in relation to the said establishment shall submit such returns to the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Punjab, maintain such accounts and provide such facilities for inspection, as the Central Government may direct from time to time.

2. The employer shall pay such inspection charges as the Central Government may, from time to time, direct under clause (a) of sub-section (3A) of section 17 of the said Act, within 15 days from the close of every month.

3. All expenses involved in the administration of the Group Insurance Scheme, including maintenance of accounts, submission of returns, payment of insurance premia, transfer of accounts, payment of inspection charges etc. shall be borne by the employer.

4. The employer shall display on the Notice Board of the establishment, a copy of the rules of the Group Insurance Scheme as approved by the Central Government and, as and when amended, alongwith a translation of the salient features thereof, in the language of the majority of the employees.

5. Whereas an employee, who is already a member of the Employees' Provident Fund or the Provident Fund of an establishment exempted under the said Act, is employed in his establishment, the employer shall immediately enrol him as a member of the Group Insurance Scheme and pay necessary premium in respect of him to the Life Insurance Corporation of India.

6. The employer shall arrange to enhance the benefits available to the employees under the Group Insurance Scheme appropriately, if the benefits available to the employees under the said scheme are enhanced, so that the benefits available under the Group Insurance Scheme are more favourable to the employees than the benefits admissible under the said Scheme.

7. Notwithstanding anything contained in the Group Insurance Scheme, if on the death of an employee the amount payable under this scheme be less than the amount that would be payable had employee been covered under the said Scheme, the employer shall pay the difference to the legal heir/nominee of the employee as compensation.

8. No amendment of the provisions of the Group Insurance Scheme shall be made without the prior approval of the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Punjab and where any amendment is likely to affect adversely the interest of the employees, the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner shall before giving his approval, give a reasonable opportunity to the employees to explain their point of view.

9. Where, for any reason, the employees of the said establishment do not remain covered under the Group Insurance Scheme of the Life Insurance Corporation of India as already adopted by the said establishment, or the benefits to the employees under this Scheme are reduced in any manner, the exemption shall be liable to be cancelled.

10. Where, for any reason, the employer fails to pay the premium etc. within the due date, as fixed by the Life Insurance Corporation of India, and the policy is allowed to lapse, the exemption is liable to be cancelled.

11. In case of default, if any made by the employer in payment of premium the responsibility for payment of assurance benefits to the nominees or the legal heirs of deceased members who would have been covered under the said Scheme but for grant of this exemption, shall be that of the employer.

12. Upon the death of the member covered under the Scheme the employer in relation to the said establishment shall ensure prompt payment of the sum assured to the nominee/legal heirs entitled for it and in any case within 7 days of the receipt of the sum assured from the Life Insurance Corporation of India.

[No. S. 35014(424)/82-PF. II]

नई दिल्ली, 20 जनवरी, 1983

का० आ० 799:—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स ब्रिटैनिया कलेण्डर मैन्युफैक्चरिंग कम्पनी 8 ए, राम कृष्ण दास लेन, कलकत्ता-19 नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एम-35017/70/82-पी. एफ. 2]

New Delhi, the 20th January, 1983

S.O. 799.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Britannia Calender Manufacturing Company, 8-A, Ram Krishna Das Lane, Calcutta-9, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S 35017(70)/82-PF. II]

का० आ० 800:—केन्द्रीय सरकार को ह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स उद्यान 90/1/1, चौरंगी रोड, कलकत्ता-20 जिसके अंतर्गत 55, बैरक रोड, बैरकपुर, 24 परगना स्थित उसकी परियोजना भी है, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों को प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एम-35017/71/82-पी. एफ. 2]

S.O. 800.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Udayan, 90/1/1, Chowringhee Road, Calcutta-20 including its Project at 55, Barrack Road, Barrackpore, 24 Parganas, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscella-

aneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(71)/82/PF. II]

का० आ० 801:—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स ईस्टर्न टिन एंड मेटल वर्क्स, 25, प्रिन्सेप स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-72, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एम-35017/81/82-पी० एफ० 2]

S.O. 801.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Eastern Services (Private) Limited, 25, Princep Street, Calcutta-72, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(81)/82/PF. II]

का० आ० 802:—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स मुर फाथर इक्विपमेंट कंपनी (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, पी-14, सी.प्राइवेट. रोड, कलकत्ता-14, जिसके अंतर्गत 21, सील लेन, कलकत्ता-15 स्थित उसका कारखाना भी है, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों को प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एम-35017/97/82-पी० एफ० 2]

S.O. 802.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs S. L. Fine Equipment Company (Private) Limited, P-14, G. I. T. Road, Calcutta-14 including its Factory at 21, Seal Lane, Calcutta-15, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central

Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(97)/82/PF. II]

का० आ० 803:—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स ईस्टर्न टिन एंड मेटल वर्क्स, 16, एम० पी० बनर्जी रोड, कलकत्ता-35, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एम-35017/98/82-पी० एफ० 2]

S.O. 803.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Eastern Tin and Metal Works, 16, S. P. Banerjee Road, Calcutta-35, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(98)/82/PF. II]

का० आ० 804:—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स कामगियल टैक्सेज डाइरेक्टरेट एम्प्लोइज को-ऑपरेटिव क्रेडिट सोसाइटी लिमिटेड, 14, बालीघाट रोड, कलकत्ता-15, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एम-35017/99/82-पी० एफ० 2]

S.O. 804.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Commercial Taxes Directorate Employees' Co-operative Credit Society Limited, 14, Baliaghata Road, Calcutta-15, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(99)/82-PF. II]

का० आ० 805 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स अजय ट्रेडिंग कम्पनी, 242, एफ, आचार्य प्रफुल्ल चन्द्रा रोड, कलकत्ता-4, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस-35017/100/82-पी० एफ० 2]

S.O. 805.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Ajay Trading Company, 242/F, Acharya Prafulla Chandra Road, Calcutta-4, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(100)/82-PF. II]

का० आ० 806 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स पायोनियर को-ऑपरेटिव कार पार्किंग सर्विसिंग एण्ड कन्स्ट्रक्शन सोसाइटी लिमिटेड, 33/1, नेताजी सुभाष मार्ग, कमरा सं० 774, 7वीं, मंजिल, कलकत्ता-1, जिसके अंतर्गत 12, लिविंगे स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-16, स्थित उसका लेखा कार्यालय भी है, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों को प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस-35017/103/82-पी० एफ० 2]

S.O. 806.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Pioneer Co-operative Car Parking Servicing and Construction Society Limited 33/1, Netaji Subhas Road, Room No. 774, 7th Floor, Calcutta-1, including its Accounts Office at 12, Lindsay Street, Calcutta-16, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(103)/82-PF. III]

का० आ० 807 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स जेबराज इन्वेस्टमेंट्स (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, 1233 GI/82—6

15-बी, क्लाइव रोड, कलकत्ता-1 जिसके अंतर्गत अनन्त निवास, 262/70, नरसी नाथी स्ट्रीट, मुम्बई-9 स्थित उसकी शाखा नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस-35017/104/82-पी० एफ० 2]

S.O. 807.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Jewraj Investments (Private) Limited, 15-B, Clive Row, Calcutta-1 including its branch at Anant Niwas, 262/70, Narsi Nathi Street, Bombay-9, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(104)/82-PF. II]

का० आ० 808 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स राही रबबर वर्क्स, 66 देबेन्द्र चन्द्र डे रोड, कलकत्ता-15, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस-35017/111/82-पी० एफ० 2]

S.O. 808.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Rahi Rubber Works, 66, Debendra Chandra Dey Road, Calcutta-15, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(111)/82-PF. II]

का० आ० 809 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स श्री मंगला ट्रेडिंग कम्पनी 19 ग्रांड फोरशे रोड, राम क्रिस्तोपुर हावड़ा-1 नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध

नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है ।

[सं० एस-35017/113/82-पीएफ-II]

S.O. 809.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Shree Mangla Trading Company, 19, Grand Forshare Road, Ramkrishnapur, Howrah-1, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S.35017(113)/82-PF.II]

का०प्रा० 810:-- केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स कलकत्ता वायर्स 944 जैसोर रोड कलकत्ता-55, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है ।

[सं० एस-35017/117/82-पीएफ-II]

S.O. 810.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Calcutta Wires, 944, Jessore Road, Calcutta-55, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(117)/82-PF.II]

का०प्रा० 811:-- केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स ईस्ट इण्डिया स्टील कारपोरेशन 21 महर्षि बेवेन्द्र रोड कलकत्ता-7 नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है ।

[सं० एस-35017/123/82-पीएफ-II]

S.O. 811.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs East India Steel Corporation, 21, Maharshi Debendra Road, Calcutta-7, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35017(123)/82-PF.II]

का०प्रा० 812:-- केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स विकास सी० वर्मा एण्ड कम्पनी (मशीनरी) प्राइवेट लिमिटेड 135 बिप्लबी रास बिहारी बासु रोड कलकत्ता-1 नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है ।

[सं० एस-35017/124/82 पीएफ-II]

S.O. 812.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Vikash C. Verma and Company (Machineries) Private Limited, 135, Biplabi Rashbehari Basu Road, Calcutta-1, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35017(124)/82-PF.II]

का०प्रा० 813:-- केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स तेगा इंडिया लिमिटेड यूनिट हाउस, (तीसरी और चौथी मंजिल बी पी-40) ब्लाक न्यू अलीपुर कलकत्ता-53, जिसके अंतर्गत डाकघर नेताजी सुभाष सेनेटोरियम कल्याणी-741251, जिला नाडिया पश्चिमी बंगाल स्थित उसका कारखाना भी है, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस-35017/125/82-पीएफ-II]

S.O. 813.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Tega India Limited, Unit House (3rd and 4th Floor), P-40, B-Block, New Alipore, Calcutta-53 including its Factory at Post Office Netaji Subhas Sanatorium, Kalyani-741251, Distt. Nadia, West Bengal, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35017(125)/82-PF-II]

का०आ० 814:—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स सिरिटी कन्जूमर्स कोऑपरेटिव स्टोर्स लिमिटेड, 32/2, चण्डीताला मेन रोड, कलकत्ता-41 नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस-35017/132/82-पीएफ-II]

S.O. 814.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Sirty Consumer's Co-operative Store Limited, 32/2, Chanditala Main Road, Calcutta-41, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35017(132)/82-PF. II]

का०आ० 815:—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स केप्टन शिपिंग इन्टरप्राइजेस (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड 8, होची मिल सारणी (पहली मंजिल), कलकत्ता-71 नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस-35017/171/82-पीएफ-II]

S.O. 815.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Capstan Shipping Enterprises (Private) limited, 8, Ho-Chi-Manh Sarani (1st Floor), Calcutta-71, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(171)/82-PF. II]

का०आ० 816:—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स केम कास्मेटिक्स, 13-ए, प्रसन्नकुमार टैगोर स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-6 नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस-35017/187/82-पीएफ-II]

S.O. 816.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Kem Cosmetics, 13-A, Prasanna Kumar Tagore Street, Calcutta-6, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(187)/82-PF. II]

का०आ० 817:—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स यूनाइटेड सेल्स एण्ड एजेन्सीस, 82, नानी गोपाल राय चौधरी एवेन्यू, कलकत्ता-14 नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस-35017/188/82-पीएफ-2]

S.O. 817.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs United Sales and Agencies, 82, Nanigopal Roy Chowdhary Avenue, Calcutta-14, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(188)/82-PF. II]

कां० प्रा० 818 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स डाटा एडवान्स सिस्टम्स (प्रा०) लिमिटेड, 26, शेक्सपियर सरानी, कलकत्ता-17, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारों भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिएं;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों को प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करता है।

[सं० एस-35017/196/82-पीएफ-II]

S.O. 818.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Data Advance Systems (Private) Limited, 26, Shakespeare Sarani, Calcutta-17, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35017(196)/82-PF.III]

कां० प्रा० 819 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स लाइमलाइट स्टैंडर्ड्स बिल्डिंग, 32/1, बी०बी० डी० बाग कलकत्ता-1, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारों भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिएं;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों को प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करता है।

[सं० एस-35017/197/82-पीएफ-II]

S.O. 819.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Lime light, Standard Building, 32/1, B. B. D. Bagh, Calcutta-1, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35017(197)/82-PF. II]

कां० प्रा० 820 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स संचायनी सेविंग्स और इन्वेस्टमेंट (इंडिया) लिमिटेड, 82/2ए बिधान सरानी, कलकत्ता-64, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारों भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिएं;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों को प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करता है।

[सं० एस-35017/198/82-पीएफ-II]

S.O. 820.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Sanchayani Savings and Investment (India) Limited, 82/2A Bidhan Sarani, Calcutta-64, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35017/(198)/82-PF. II]

कां० प्रा० 821 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स कमल ट्रेडर्स, 70 कॉटन स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-7, अर्थात् फौजरो जो 3, कोसिपूर रोड, कलकत्ता-2 में स्थित है, के सहित, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारों भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिएं;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों को प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करता है।

[सं० एस-35017/199/82 पीएफ-II]

S.O. 821.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Kamal Traders, 70, Cotton Street, Calcutta-7 including its factory at 3, Cossipore Road, Calcutta-2, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35017(199)/82-PF. II]

कां० प्रा० 822 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स बैबल बिजनैस मशीन्स लिमिटेड, बैबल इंडस्ट्रियल कम्प्लेक्स पी-1, ताराशाला रोड, कलकत्ता-88 अपनी रजिस्टर्ड ऑफिस जो 225-ई, आचार्य जगदीश चन्द्र बसु

रोड, कलकत्ता-20 में स्थित है, के सहित नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस०-35017/200/82-पीएफ-II]

S.O. 822.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Webel Business Machines Limited, Webel Industrial Complex P-1, Taratala Road, Calcutta-88 including its Registered Office at 225-E, Acharya Jagadish Chandra Bose Road, Calcutta-20, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35017(200)/82-PF. II]

का०आ० 823 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स अग्रवाल कम्पनी (प्रा०) लिमिटेड, 135 बिपलाबा राश बिहारी बसु रोड, कलकत्ता-1, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस०-35017/201/82-पीएफ-II]

S.O. 823.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Agarwal Company (Private) Limited, 135, Biplabi Rash Behari Basu Road, Calcutta-1, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(201)/82-PF. II]

का०आ० 824 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स केन्द्रीन आफिस आफ दी अकाउन्टेन्ट जनरल, व्हेस्ट बंगाल, ट्रेजरी बिल्डिंग, कलकत्ता-1, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात

पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस०-35017/202/82-पीएफ-II]

S.O. 824.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Canteen, Office of the Accountant-General, West Bengal, Treasury Building, Calcutta-1, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(202)/82-PF-II]

का०आ० 825 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स केवलराम शिवकुमार, 72, कॉटन स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-17 अपनी फॅक्टरी जो 3, कोसीपुर रोड, कलकत्ता-2 में स्थित है, के सहित नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस०-35017/203/82-पीएफ-II]

S.O. 825.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Kewalram Shiwkumar, 72, Cotton Street, Calcutta-17 including its factory at 3, Cossipore Road, Calcutta-2, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(203)/82-PF-II]

का०आ० 826 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स अरोरा इंजीनियरिंग इंडस्ट्रीज इंडिया (प्रा०) लिमिटेड, 15 शेक्सपियर सरानी, कलकत्ता-71, अपने प्रशासनिक कार्यालय जो टाटा सेंटर, ग्राउन्ड फ्लोर, 43, चौरंगी रोड, कलकत्ता-1 और शाखा जो 22, इक्षर सक्लि

रोड, जमशेदपुर-1 में है, के सहित नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस-35017/204/82-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 826.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Aurora Engineering Industries (India) (Private) Limited, 15, Shakespeare Sarani, Calcutta-71 including its Administrative Office at Tata Centre, Ground Floor, 43, Chowringhee Road, Calcutta-1 and branch at 22, Inner Circle Road, Jamshedpur-1, have agreed that the Provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment,

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35017(204)/82-PF. II]

का०आ० 827 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स शक्ति आयल मिल, बी० टी० रोडे, पोस्ट आफिस, अग्रपारा, मोलाहट, 24-परगनास, पश्चिम बंगाल नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किये जाने चाहिये;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस-35017/205/82-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 827.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Sakti Oil Mill, B.T. Road, Post Office Agarpura, Mollarhat, 24-Parganas, West Bengal, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35017(205)/82-PF-III]

का०आ० 828 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स इंडियन नेशनल इंजीनियरिंग वर्क्स, 74/ए/3, बनारस रोड, हावड़ा-711101 नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध

अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किये जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस-35017/206/82-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 828.—Whereas appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Indian National Engineering Works, 74/A/3, Benaras Road, Howrah-711101, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35017(206)/82-PF. III]

का०आ० 829—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स दि बोरल यूनियन कोपरेटिव बैंक लिमिटेड, पोस्ट आफिस और गांव बोरल, जिला 24-परगनाज, पश्चिम बंगाल नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किये जाने चाहिये;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस-35017/207/82-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 829.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs The Boral Union Co-operative Bank Limited, Post Office and Village Boral, District 24-Parganas, West Bengal, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35017(207)/82-PF. III]

का०आ० 830—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स सैन्ट्रल एक्साइज व कस्टम विभागीय केन्टीन, कस्टम हाउस, 15/1, स्ट्रान्ध रोड, कलकत्ता-2, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किया जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस-35017/208/82-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 830.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Central Excise and Customs Departmental Canteen, Custom House, 15/1, Strand Road, Calcutta-1, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(208)/82-PF-II]

का०आ० 831.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स जी० के० डब्ल्यू०, वर्क्स एम्प्लॉईज कोपरेटिव स्टोर्स लिमिटेड, 168/2, अन्दुल रोड, हावड़ा-711103 नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस०-35017/209/82-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 831.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs G.K.W. Works Employees' Co-operative Stores Limited, 168/2, Andul Road, Howrah-711103, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(209)/82-PF-II]

का०आ० 832.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स मिना इलेक्ट्रीकल वर्क्स, 1/4, तरन कृष्णा नसकार लेन, कलकत्ता-10, व उसी भवन में स्थित उसके कार्यालय सहित नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस०-35017/210/82-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 832.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Mina Electrical Works, 1/4, Taran Krishna Naskar Lane, Calcutta-10 including its Office in the same premises, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions

Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(210)/82-PF. II]

का०आ० 833.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स श्री कृष्ण कम्पनी, 4, हजारी मला साहारोड, हावड़ा-6, और उनके 15, ब्राबोर्न रोड, कलकत्ता-1, स्थित उसके कार्यालय सहित नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किय जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस०-35017/211/81-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 833.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Shree Krishna Company, 4, Hazari Malla Saha Road, Howrah-6 including its office at 15, Brabourne Road, Calcutta-1, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(211)/82-PF. II]

का०आ० 834.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स कृष्णा लेमिनेटिंग इण्डस्ट्रीज, 13-ए, जे० एन० मुखर्जी रोड, हावड़ा-6 व 15, ब्राबोर्न रोड, कलकत्ता-1, स्थित उसके कार्यालय सहित नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किय जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस०-35017/212/82-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 834.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Krishna Laminating Industries, 13-A, J. N. Mukherjee Road, Howrah-6 including its office at 15, Brabourne Road, Calcutta-1, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[S. 35017(212)/82-PF, II]

का० प्रा० 835.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स कलकत्ता प्रिंटिंग इंकस ((प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, 22/2, चांदीतोला, मेन रोड, बेहला, कलकत्ता-53, व उसी भवन में स्थित उसके प्रशासनिक कार्यालय सहित नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस०-35017/216/82-पी० एफ०-2]

S.O. 835.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Calcutta Printing Inks (Private) Limited, 22/2, Chanditola Main Road, Behala, Calcutta-53 including its Administrative Office in the same premises, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952, (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(216)/82-PF-II]

का० प्रा० 836.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स ट्रीट्रो ट्रेण्ड (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, 118, डा० सुन्दरी मोहन एवन्स, कलकत्ता-14, व 14, राधानाथ चौधरी रोड, कलकत्ता-15, स्थित कार्यालय स्टोर सहित नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[संख्या एस-35017/217/82-पी० एफ०-2]

S.O. 836.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Trio Trend (Private) Limited, 118, Dr. Sundari Mohan Avenue, Calcutta-14 including its Office Store, at 14 Radhanath Chowhury Road, Calcutta-15, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35017(217)/82-PF, II]

का० प्रा० 837.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स प्राथो फार्मा (प्रा०) लिमिटेड, पी-5, ब्लॉक-डी, कल्याणी इन्डस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, कल्याणी, पश्चिम बंगाल, और उनके 1/1ए रानी हर्षमुखी रोड, कलकत्ता-2, स्थित पंजीकृत कार्यालय और 20-बी, काली दत्ता स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-5 स्थित नगर कार्यालय सहित नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस-35017/218/82-पी० एफ०-2]

S.O. 837.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Ortho Pharma (Private) Limited, P-5, Block-D, Kalyani Industrial Estate, Kalyani, West, Bengal, including its Registered Office at 1/1A, Rani Harsamukhi Road, Calcutta-2 and city Office at 20B, Kali Dutta Street, Calcutta-5, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(218)/82-PF, II]

का० प्रा० 838.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स दि इन्डो असाही ग्लास कम्पनी लिमिटेड, बरासत रोड, सोडेपुर, 24-परगनास, पश्चिम बंगाल, व 3 हंगरफोर्ड स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-17, स्थित उनके पंजीकृत व मुख्यालय सहित नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस०-35017/219/82-पी० एफ०-2]

S.O. 838.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs The Indo Asahi Glass Company Limited, Barasat Road, Sodepore, 24-Parganas, West Bengal including its Registered and Head Office at 3, Hungerford Street, Calcutta-17, have agreed that the provisions of the

Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35017(219)/82-PF. II]

का० आ० 839.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स बिस्वरा कांस्टोरेज (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, मार्ग दशवारा रोड, डाकघरा रामेश्वरपुर, जिला हुगली, और 154, आचार्य जगदीश बाम रोड, कलकत्ता-14 स्थित, उनके मुख्यालय सहित, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस-35017/220/82-पी० एफ-2]

S.O. 839.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Biswarup Cold Storage (Private) Limited, Marga Dashghara Road, Post Office Rameshwarpur, District Hooghly including its Head Office at 154, Acharya Jagadish Bose Road, Calcutta-14, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(220)/82-PF. II]

का० आ० 840.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स वेस्ट बंगाल फिलामेंट्स एंड लेन्स लिमिटेड, यूले हाउस, 8, क्लाइव रो, कलकत्ता-1, और कल्यानी, जिला नदिया, पश्चिम बंगाल स्थित उनकी फैक्टरी सहित, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस-35017/221/82-पी० एफ-2]

S.O. 840.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs West Bengal Filaments

1233 GI/82-7.

and Lamps Limited, Yule House, 3, Clive Row, Calcutta-1 including its Factory at Kalyani, District Nadia, West Bengal, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35017(221)/82-PF. II]

का० आ० 841.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स हुगली केमिकल इन्डस्ट्रीज (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, दुइलया, बरास्ता, अन्दुल मुरी, हावड़ा, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस-35017/222/82-पी० एफ-2]

S.O. 841.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Hooghly Chemical Industries (Private) Limited, Duilaya, Via Andul-Mouri, Howrah, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(222)/82-PF. II]

का० आ० 842.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स क्वालिटी प्रिंटिंग एंड स्टेशनरी कन्सर्न, 6/ए, क्रीक रो, कलकत्ता-14, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस-35017/223/82-पी० एफ-2]

S.O. 842.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Quality Printing and Stationery Concern, 6/A, Creek Row, Calcutta-14, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(223)/82-PF. II]

का० आ० 843:—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स स्टील अथॉरिटी आफ इंडिया इम्लार्इज कोपरेटिव क्रेडिट सोसाइटी लिमिटेड, 2, फेयरली प्लेस, कलकत्ता-1, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 10) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस-35017/224/82-पी० एफ-2]

S.O. 843.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Steel Authority of India Employees' Co-operative Credit Society Limited, 2, Fairlie Place, Calcutta-1, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(224)/82-PF. II]

का० आ० 844:—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स वेस्टेंड पिगमेंट्स एंड केमिकल्स (प्रा०) लिमिटेड, 103, पार्क स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-16 अपने रजिस्टर्ड आफिस जो डी० 167/10, आयल इन्स्टालेशन रोड, कलकत्ता-43 में स्थित है, के सहित नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस-35017/225/82-पी० एफ-2]

S.O. 844.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs West End Pigments and Chemicals (Private) Limited, 103, Park Street Calcutta-16, including its Registered Office at D-167/10, Oil Installation Road, Calcutta-43, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(225)/82-PF. II]

का० आ० 845:—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स श्री नरसिंह सहाय मुधनगोपाल (कलकत्ता), 55, एजरा स्ट्रीट, (पोस्ट बॉक्स सं० 709), कलकत्ता-1, नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस-35017/227/82-पी० एफ-2]

S.O. 845.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Shree Narsinghahay Mudungopal (Calcutta), 55, Ezra Street, P. Box No. 709, Calcutta-1, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S. 35017(227)/82-PF. II]

नई दिल्ली, 21 जनवरी, 1983

का० आ० 846:—मैसर्स ऐसोसिएटेड सीमेंट कम्पनीज लिमिटेड, खनारी नीमेंट वर्क्स, पोस्ट आफिस : खलारी, डिस्ट्रिक्ट रांची, बिहार (बिहार 16) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त स्थापन कहा गया है) ने कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 17 की उपधारा (4) के अधीन छूट दिए जाने के लिए आवेदन किया है :

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त स्थापन के कर्मचारी; किसी पृथक अभिदाय प्रीमियम का मंदाय किए बिना ही, भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम की सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन जीवन बीमा के रूप में फायदे उठा न्त है और ऐसे कर्मचारियों के लिए ये फायदे उन फायदों से अधिक अनुकूल हैं जो कर्मचारी निक्षेप सहबद्ध बीमा स्कीम, 1976 (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त स्कीम कहा गया है) के अधीन उन्हें अनुज्ञेय हैं ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उपधारा (2क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते

हुए और इससे उपावृद्ध अनुमोचों में विनिर्दिष्ट शर्तों के अग्रोत रहते हुए, उक्त स्थापन को तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए उक्त स्कीम के सभी उपबन्धों के प्रवर्तन से छूट देती है।

अनुसूची

1. उक्त स्थापन के संबन्ध में नियोजक प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त बिहार को ऐसी विवरणियां भेजेगा और ऐसे लेखा रखेगा तथा निरीक्षण के लिए ऐसी सुविधाएं प्रदान करेगा जो केन्द्रीय सरकार, समय-समय पर निर्दिष्ट करें।

2. नियोजक, ऐसे निरीक्षण प्रभारों का प्रत्येक मास को समाप्ति के 15 दिन के भीतर संदाय करेगा जो केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उपधारा (3क) के खंड (क) के अधीन समय-समय पर निर्दिष्ट करें।

3. सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के प्रणामन में, जिसके अन्तर्गत लेखाओं का रखा जाना, विवरणियों का प्रस्तुत किया जाना, बीमा प्रीमियम का संदाय, लेखाओं का अन्तरण, निरीक्षण प्रभारों का संदाय आदि भी है, होने वाले सभी व्ययों का वहन नियोजक द्वारा किया जाएगा।

4. नियोजक, केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा यथा अनुमोदित सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के नियमों की एक प्रति, और जब कभी उनमें संशोधन किया जाए, तब उस संशोधन की प्रति तथा कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या की भाषा में उसकी मुख्य बातों का अनुवाद, स्थापन के सूचना-पट्ट पर प्रदर्शित करेगा।

5. यदि कोई ऐसा कर्मचारी, जो कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि का या उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन छूट प्राप्त किसी स्थापन की भविष्य निधि का पहले ही सदस्य है, उसके स्थापन में नियोजित किया जाता है तो, नियोजक सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के सदस्य के रूप में उसका नाम तुरन्त दर्ज करेगा और उसकी बाबत आवश्यक प्रीमियम भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम को संदत्त करेगा।

6. यदि उक्त स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को उपलब्ध फायदे बढ़ाए जाते हैं तो, नियोजक सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को उपलब्ध फायदों में समुचित रूप से वृद्धि की जाने की व्यवस्था करेगा, जिससे कि कर्मचारियों के लिए सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन उपलब्ध फायदे उन फायदों से अधिक अनुकूल हों, जो उक्त स्कीम के अधीन अनुप्रेय हैं।

7. सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम में किसी बात के होते हुए भी, यदि किसी कर्मचारी की मृत्यु पर इस स्कीम के अधीन संदेय रकम उस रकम से कम है, जो कर्मचारी को उस दशा में संदेय होती जब वह उक्त स्कीम के अधीन होता तो, नियोजक कर्मचारी के विधिक वारिस/नाम निर्देशित की प्रतिकर के रूप में दोनों रकमों के अन्तर के बराबर रकम का संदाय करेगा।

8. सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के उपबन्धों में कोई भी संशोधन, प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त बिहार के पूर्व

अनुमोदन के बिना नहीं किया जायेगा और जहां किसी संशोधन से कर्मचारियों के हित पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना हो वहां, प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त, अपना अनुमोदन देने से पूर्व कर्मचारियों को अपना दृष्टिकोण स्पष्ट करने का युक्तियुक्त अवसर देगा।

9. यदि किसी कारणवश, स्थापन के कर्मचारी, भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम की उस सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के, जिसे स्थापन पहले अपना चुका है अधीन नहीं रह जाते हैं, या इस स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को प्राप्त होने वाले फायदे किसी रीति से कम हो जाते हैं, तो यह छूट रद्द की जा सकती है।

10. यदि किसी कारणवश, नियोजक उस नियत तारीख के भीतर, जो भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम नियत करे, प्रीमियम का संदाय करने में असफल रहता है, और पालिसी को व्यपगत हो जाने दिया जाता है तो, छूट रद्द की जा सकती है।

11. नियोजक द्वारा प्रीमियम के संदाय में किए गए किसी व्यतिक्रम की दशा में उन मृत सदस्यों के नामनिर्देशितियों या विधिक वारिसों को जो यदि यह, छूट न दी गई होती तो उक्त स्कीम के अन्तर्गत होते बीमा फायदों के संदाय का उत्तरदायित्व नियोजक पर होगा।

12. उक्त स्थापन के संबन्ध में नियोजक, इस स्कीम के अधीन आने वाले किसी सदस्य की मृत्यु होने पर उसके हक्दार नाम निर्देशितियों/विधिक वारिसों की बीमाकृत रकम का संदाय तत्परता से और प्रत्येक दिशा में भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम से बीमाकृत रकम प्राप्त होने के सात दिन के भीतर सुनिश्चित करेगा।

[संख्या एस-35014/481/82-पी०एफ०2]

New Delhi, the 21st January, 1983

S.O. 846.—Whereas Messrs The Associated Cement Companies Ltd., Khalari Cement Works, P.O. Khalari, District Ranchi, Bihar (BR/16) (hereinafter referred to as the said establishment) have applied for exemption under sub-section (2A) of section 17 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act (19 of 1952) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act);

And whereas, the Central Government is satisfied that the employees of the said establishment are, without making any separate contribution or payment of premium, in enjoyment of benefits under the Group Insurance Scheme of the Life Insurance Corporation of India in the nature of Life Insurance which are more favourable to such employees than the benefits admissible under the Employees Deposit-Linked Insurance Scheme, 1976 (hereinafter referred to as the said Scheme);

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2A) of section 17 of the said Act and subject to the conditions specified in the Schedule annexed hereto, the Central Government hereby exempts the said establishment from the operation of all the provisions of the said Scheme for a period of three years.

SCHEDULE

1. The employer in relation to the said establishment shall submit such returns to the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Bihar, maintain such accounts and provide such facilities

ties for inspection, as the Central Government may direct from time to time.

2. The employer shall pay such inspection charges as the Central Government may, from time to time, direct under clause (a) of sub-section (3A) of section 17 of the said Act, within 15 days from the close of every month.

3. All expenses involved in the administration of the Group Insurance Scheme, including maintenance of accounts, submission of returns, payment of insurance premia, transfer of accounts, payment of inspection charges etc. shall be borne by the employer.

4. The employer shall display on the Notice Board of the establishment, a copy of the rules of the Group Insurance Scheme as approved by the Central Government and, as and when amended, alongwith a translation of the salient features thereof, in the language of the majority of the employees.

5. Whereas an employee, who is already a member of the Employees' Provident Fund or the Provident Fund of an establishment exempted under the said Act, is employed in his establishment, the employer shall immediately enrol him as a member of the Group Insurance Scheme and pay necessary premium in respect of him to the Life Insurance Corporation of India.

6. The employer shall arrange to enhance the benefits available to the employees under the Group Insurance Scheme appropriately, if the benefits available to the employees under the said Scheme are enhanced, so that the benefits available under the Group Insurance Scheme are more favourable to the employees than the benefits admissible under the said Scheme.

7. Notwithstanding anything contained in the Group Insurance Scheme, if on the death of an employee the amount payable under this scheme be less than the amount that would be payable had employee been covered under the said Scheme, the employer shall pay the difference to the legal heir/nominee of the employee as compensation.

8. No amendment of the provisions of the Group Insurance Scheme shall be made without the prior approval of the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Bihar and where any amendment is likely to affect adversely the interest of the employees, the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner shall before giving his approval, give a reasonable opportunity to the employees to explain their point of view.

9. Where, for any reason, the employees of the said establishment do not remain covered under the Group Insurance Scheme of the Life Insurance Corporation of India as already adopted by the said establishment, or the benefits to the employees under this Scheme are reduced in any manner, the exemption shall be liable to be cancelled.

10. Where, for any reason, the employer fails to pay the premium etc. within the due date, as fixed by the Life Insurance Corporation of India, and the policy is allowed to lapse, the exemption is liable to be cancelled.

11. In case of default, if any made by the employer in payment of premium the responsibility for payment of assurance benefits to the nominees or the legal heirs of deceased members who would have been covered under the said Scheme but for grant of this exemption, shall be that of the employer.

12. Upon the death of the member covered under the Scheme the employer in relation to the said establishment shall ensure prompt payment of the sum assured to the nominee/legal heirs entitled for it and in any case within 7 days of the receipt of the sum assured from the Life Insurance Corporation of India.

[No. S-35014(481)/82-PF.II]

का० आ० 847.—मैसर्स एसोसिएटेड सीमेन्ट कम्पनीज लिमिटेड, जायबासा सीमेन्ट वर्कर्स, डाकघर झिन्कापानी-833215 (एस०ई०रेलवे), जिला सिन्धुत, बिहार (बीआर०-13),

(जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त स्थापन कहा गया है) के कर्मचारों भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 17 की उपधारा (2क) के अधीन छूट दिए जाने के लिए आवेदन किया है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का समाधान हा गया है कि उक्त स्थापन के कर्मचारी, किसी पृथक् अधिधाय या प्रीमियम का सन्दाय किए बिना ही, भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम की सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन जीवन बीमा के रूप में फायदे उठा रहे हैं और ऐसे कर्मचारियों के लिए ये फायदे उन फायदों से अधिक अनुकूल हैं जो कर्मचारी निक्षेप सहस्रद्व बीमा स्कीम, 1976 (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त स्कीम कहा गया है) के अधीन उन्हें अनुज्ञेय है ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उपधारा (2क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और इसमें उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए उक्त स्थापन की तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए उक्त स्कीम के सभी उपबन्धों के प्रवर्तन से छूट देती है।

अनुसूची

1. उक्त स्थापन के संबंध में नियोजक प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त बिहार को ऐसी विवरणियां भेजेगा और ऐसे लेखा रखेगा तथा निरीक्षण के लिए ऐसी सुविधाएं प्रदान करेगा जो केन्द्रीय सरकार, समय-समय पर निर्दिष्ट करे।

2. नियोजक, ऐसे निरीक्षण प्रश्नों का प्रत्येक माम की समाप्ति के 15 दिन के भीतर सन्दाय करेगा जो केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उपधारा (3क) के खण्ड (क) के अधीन समय-समय पर निर्दिष्ट करें।

3. सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के प्रशासन में, जिसके अन्तर्गत लेखाओं का रखा जाना, विवरणियों का प्रस्तुत किया जाना, बीमा प्रीमियम का सन्दाय, लेखाओं का अन्तरण, निरीक्षण, प्रश्नों का सन्दाय आदि भी है, होने वाले सभी व्ययों का वहन नियोजक द्वारा किया जाएगा।

4. नियोजक, केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा यथा अनुमोदित सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के नियमों की एक प्रति, और जब कभी उनमें संशोधन किया जाए, तब उस संशोधन की प्रति तथा कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या की भाषा में उसकी मुख्य बातों का अनुवाद, स्थापन के सूचना-पट्ट पर प्रदर्शित करेगा।

5. यदि कोई ऐसा कर्मचारी, जो कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि का या उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन छूट प्राप्त किसी स्थापन की भविष्य निधि का पहले ही सदस्य है, उसके स्थापन में नियोजित किया जाता है तो, नियोजक सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम सदस्य के रूप में उसका नाम तुरन्त दर्ज करेगा और उसकी बाबत आवश्यक प्रीमियम भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम को भेज देता है।

6. यदि उक्त स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को उपलब्ध फायदे बढ़ाए जाते हैं तो, नियोजक सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के

अधीन कर्मचारियों को उपलब्ध फायदों में समुचित रूप से वृद्धि की जाने की व्यवस्था करेगा, जिसमें कि कर्मचारियों के लिए सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन उपलब्ध फायदे उस फायदों से अधिक अनुभूत हों, जो उक्त स्कीम के अधीन अनुभूत है।

7. सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम में किसी बात के होते हुए भी, यदि किसी कर्मचारी का मृत्यु पर इस स्कीम के अधीन संदेय रकम उस रकम से कम है, जो कर्मचारी का उस दशा में संदेय होता, जब वह उक्त स्कीम के अधीन होता तो, नियोजक कर्मचारी के विधिक वारिस नामनिर्देशितों को प्रतिकर के रूप में दोनों रकमों के अन्तर के बराबर रकम का संदाय करेगा।

8. सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के उद्देश्यों में कोई भी संशोधन, प्रादेशिक भाविष्य निधि आयुक्त बिहार के पूर्व अनुमोदन के बिना नहीं किया जायेगा और जहाँ किसी संशोधन से कर्मचारियों के हित पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव पड़ने का संभावना हो वहाँ प्रादेशिक भाविष्य निधि आयुक्त, अपना अनुमोदन देने से पूर्व-कर्मचारियों को अपना दृष्टिकोण स्पष्ट करने का व्यक्तिगत अवसर देगा।

9. यदि किसी कारणवश, स्थापन के कर्मचारी, भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम को उस सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के, जिस स्थापन पहले अपना चुका है अधीन नहीं रह जाते हैं, या इस स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को प्राप्त होने वाले फायदे किसी रीति से कम हो जाते हैं, तो यह छूट रद्द की जा सकती है।

10. यदि किसी कारणवश, नियोजक उस नियत तारीख के, भीतर, जो भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम नियत करें, प्रीमियम का संदाय करने में असफल रहता है, और पालिसी को व्यपगत हो जाने दिया जाता है तो, छूट रद्द की जा सकती है।

11. नियोजक द्वारा प्रीमियम के संदाय में किए गए किसी व्यतिक्रम की दशा में उन मृत सदस्यों के नामनिर्देशितियों या विधिक वारिसों को जो यदि यह, छूट न दी गई होती तो उक्त स्कीम के अन्तर्गत होते, बीमा फायदों के संदाय का उत्तरदायित्व नियोजक पर होगा।

12. उक्त स्थापन के संबंध में नियोजक, इस स्कीम के अधीन आने वाले किसी सदस्य को मृत्यु होने पर उसके हकदार नाम निर्देशितियों/विधिक वारिसों की बीमाकृत रकम का संदाय तत्परता से चार प्रत्येक दशा में भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम से बीमाकृत रकम प्राप्त होने के मातृ दिनांक के भीतर सुनिश्चित करेगा।

[संख्या एस०-35014/484/82-प०एफ०-2]

S.O. 847.—Whereas Messrs The Association Cement Companies Ltd., Chhabra Cement Works, P.O. Jharkani 833215 (S.E. Rly.), District Singhbhum, Bihar (BR-13) (hereinafter referred to as the said establishment) have applied for exemption under sub-section (2A) of section 17 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act (19 of 1952) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act);

And whereas, the Central Government is satisfied that the employees of the said establishment are, without making any separate contribution or payment of premium, in enjoyment of benefits under the Group Insurance Scheme of the Life Insurance Corporation of India in the nature of Life Insurance which are more favourable to such employees than the benefits admissible under the Employees Deposit-Linked Insurance Scheme, 1976 (hereinafter referred to as the said Scheme);

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2A) of section 17 of the said Act and subject to the conditions specified in the Schedule annexed hereto, the Central Government hereby exempts the said establishment from the operation of all the provisions of the said Scheme for a period of three years.

SCHEDULE

1. The employer in relation to the said establishment shall submit such returns to the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Bihar, maintain such accounts and provide such facilities for inspection, as the Central Government may direct from time to time.

2. The employer shall pay such inspection charges as the Central Government may, from time to time, direct under clause (a) of sub-section (3A) of section 17 of the said Act, within 15 days from the close of every month.

3. All expenses involved in the administration of the Group Insurance Scheme, including maintenance of accounts, submission of returns, payment of insurance premia, transfer of accounts, payment of inspection charges etc. shall be borne by the employer.

4. The employer shall display on the Notice Board of the establishment, a copy of the rules of the Group Insurance Scheme as approved by the Central Government and, as and when amended, alongwith a translation of the salient features thereof, in the language of the majority of the employees.

5. Whereas an employee, who is already a member of the Employees' Provident Fund or the Provident Fund of an establishment exempted under the said Act, is employed in his establishment, the employer shall immediately enrol him as a member of the Group Insurance Scheme and pay necessary premium in respect of him to the Life Insurance Corporation of India.

6. The employer shall arrange to enhance the benefits available to the employees under the Group Insurance Scheme appropriately, if the benefits available to the employees under the said Scheme are enhanced, so that the benefits available under the Group Insurance Scheme are more favourable to the employees than the benefits admissible under the said Scheme.

7. Notwithstanding anything contained in the Group Insurance Scheme, if on the death of an employee the amount payable under this scheme be less than the amount that would be payable had employee been covered under the said Scheme, the employer shall pay the difference to the legal heir/nominee of the employee as compensation.

8. No amendment of the provisions of the Group Insurance Scheme shall be made without the prior approval of the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Bihar and where any amendment is likely to affect adversely the interest of the employees, the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner shall before giving his approval, give a reasonable opportunity to the employees to explain their point of view.

9. Where, for any reason, the employees of the said establishment do not remain covered under the Group Insurance Scheme of the Life Insurance Corporation of India as already adopted by the said establishment, or the benefits to the employees under this Scheme are reduced in any manner, the exemption shall be liable to be cancelled.

10. Where, for any reason, the employer fails to pay the premium etc. within the due date, as fixed by the Life Insurance Corporation of India and the policy is allowed to lapse the exemption is liable to be cancelled.

11. In case of default, if any made by the employer in payment of premium the responsibility for payment of assurance benefits to the nominees or the legal heirs of deceased

members who would have been covered under the said Scheme but for grant of this exemption, shall be that of the employer.

12. Upon the death of the member covered under the Scheme the employer in relation to the said establishment shall ensure prompt payment of the sum assured to the nominee/legal heirs entitled for it and in any case within 7 days of the receipt of the sum assured from the Life Insurance Corporation of India.

[No. S-35014(484)/82-PF.II]

का०आ० 848.—मैसर्स एमोमिएटेड सीमेन्ट कम्पनी लिमिटेड, सिदारी सीमेन्ट वर्क, डाकघर-ए०सी०सी० कॉलोनी, सिन्धरी, जिला धनबाद-828124, बिहार (बिहार 169), (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त स्थापन कहा गया है) ने कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है की धारा 17 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन छूट दिए जाने के लिए आवेदन किया है:

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त स्थापन के कर्मचारी, किसी पृथक अभिदाय या प्रीमियम का सन्दाय किए बिना ही, भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम की सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन जीवन बीमा के रूप फायदे उठा रहे हैं, और ऐसे कर्मचारियों के लिए ये फायदे उन फायदों से अधिक अनुकूल हैं जो कर्मचारि निर्क्षेप सहबद्ध बीमा स्कीम, 1976 (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त स्कीम कहा गया है) के अधीन उन्हें अनुज्ञेय है,

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उपधारा (2क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, और इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए उक्त स्थापन का तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए उक्त स्कीम के सभी उपबन्धों के प्रवर्तन में छूट देती है।

अनुसूची

1. उक्त स्थापन के संबंध में नियोजक प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त, बिहार को ऐसी विवरणियाँ भेजेगा और ऐसे लेखा रखेगा तथा निरीक्षण के लिए मुविवाए प्रदान करेगा जो केन्द्रीय सरकार, समय-समय पर निर्दिष्ट करे।

2. नियोजक, ऐसे निरीक्षण प्रभागों का प्रत्येक मास की समाप्ति के 15 दिन के भीतर सन्दाय करेगा जो केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उपधारा (3क) के खण्ड (क) के अधीन समय-समय पर निर्दिष्ट करे।

3. सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के प्रशासन में, जिसके अन्तर्गत लेखाओं का रखा जाना, विवरणियों का प्रस्तुत किया जाना, बीमा प्रीमियम का सन्दाय, लेखाओं का अन्तरण, निरीक्षण प्रभागों का सन्दाय आदि भी है, होने वाले सभी व्ययों का वहन नियोजक द्वारा किया जाएगा।

4. नियोजक, केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा यथा अनुमोदित सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के नियमों की एक प्रति, और जब

कभी उनमें संशोधन किया जाए, तब उस संशोधन की प्रति तथा कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या की भाषा में उसकी मुख्य बातों का अनुवाद, स्थापन के सूचना पट्ट पर प्रदर्शित करेगा।

5. यदि कोई ऐसा कर्मचारी, जो कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि का या उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन छूट प्राप्त किसी स्थापन की भविष्य निधि का पहले ही सदस्य है, उसके स्थापन में नियोजित किया जाता है तो, नियोजक सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के सदस्य के रूप में उसका नाम तुरन्त दर्ज करेगा और उसकी बाबत आवश्यक प्रीमियम भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम को सन्दाय करेगा।

6. यदि उक्त स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को उपलब्ध फायदे बढ़ाए जाते हैं तो, नियोजक सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को उपलब्ध फायदों में समुचित रूप से वृद्धि की जाने की व्यवस्था करेगा, जिससे कि कर्मचारियों के लिए सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन उपलब्ध फायदे उन फायदों से अधिक अनुकूल हों, जो उक्त स्कीम अधीन अनुज्ञेय है।

7. सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम में किसी बात के होते हुए भी, यदि किसी कर्मचारी की मृत्यु पर इस स्कीम के अधीन संदेय रकम उस रकम से कम है, जो कर्मचारी को उस दशा में संदेय होती, जब वह उक्त स्कीम के अधीन होता तो, नियोजक कर्मचारी के विधिक वारिस/नाम निर्देशिनी को प्रतिकर के रूप में दोनों रकमों के अन्तर के बराबर रकम का सन्दाय करेगा।

8. सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के उपबन्धों में कोई भी संशोधन प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त बिहार के पूर्व अनुमोदन के बिना नहीं किया जायेगा और जहाँ किसी संशोधन से कर्मचारियों के हित पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना हो वहाँ, प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त, अपना अनुमोदन देने से पूर्व कर्मचारियों को अपना दृष्टिकोण स्पष्ट करने का युक्तियुक्त अवसर देगा।

9. यदि किसी कारणवश, स्थापन के कर्मचारी, भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम की उस सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के, जिसे स्थापन पहले अपना चुका है अधीन नहीं रह जाते हैं, या इस स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को प्राप्त होने वाले फायदे किसी रीति से कम हो जाते हैं, तो यह छूट रद्द की जा सकती है।

10. यदि किसी कारणवश, नियोजक उस नियत तारीख के भीतर, जो भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम नियत करें, प्रीमियम का सन्दाय करने में असफल रहता है, और पालिसी को व्यपगत हो जाने दिया जाता है तो, छूट रद्द की जा सकती है।

11. नियोजक द्वारा प्रीमियम के सन्दाय में किए गए किसी व्यतिक्रम की दशा में उन मृत सदस्यों के नामनिर्देशितियों या विधिक वारिसों को जो यदि यह, छूट न दी गई होती तो उक्त स्कीम के अन्तर्गत होते, बीमा फायदों के सन्दाय का उत्तरदायित्व नियोजक पर होगा।

12. उक्त स्थापन के संबंध में नियोजक, इस स्कीम के अधीन आने वाले किसी सदस्य की मृत्यु होने पर उसके हकदार नाम निर्देशितियों/विधिक वारिसों की बीमाकृत रकम का संदाय तत्परता से और प्रत्येक दशा में भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम से बीमाकृत रकम प्राप्त होने के सात दिन के भीतर सुनिश्चित करेगा।

[संख्या एस०-35014/482/82-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 848.—Whereas Messrs The Associated Cement Companies Ltd., Sindri Cement Works, P.O. ACC Colony, Sindri, District Dhanbad-826124, Bihar (BR-163) (hereinafter referred to as the said establishment) have applied for exemption under sub-section (2A) of section 17 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act (19 of 1952) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act);

And whereas, the Central Government is satisfied that the employees of the said establishment are, without making any separate contribution or payment of premium, in enjoyment of benefits under the Group Insurance Scheme of the Life Insurance Corporation of India in the nature of Life Insurance which are more favourable to such employees than the benefits admissible under the Employees Deposit-Linked Insurance Scheme, 1976 (hereinafter referred to as the said Scheme);

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2A) of section 17 of the said Act and subject to the conditions specified in the Schedule annexed hereto, the Central Government hereby exempts the said establishment from the operation of all the provisions of the said Scheme for a period of three years.

SCHEDULE

1. The employer in relation to the said establishment shall submit such returns to the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Bihar, maintain such accounts and provide such facilities for inspection, as the Central Government may direct from time to time.

2. The employer shall pay such inspection charges as the Central Government may, from time to time, direct under clause (a) of sub-section (3A) of section 17 of the said Act, within 15 days from the close of every month.

3. All expenses involved in the administration of the Group Insurance Scheme, including maintenance of accounts, submission of returns, payment of insurance premia, transfer of accounts, payment of inspection charges etc. shall be borne by the employer.

4. The employer shall display on the Notice Board of the establishment, a copy of the rules of the Group Insurance Scheme as approved by the Central Government and, as and when amended, alongwith a translation of the salient features thereof, in the language of the majority of the employees.

5. Whereas an employee, who is already a member of the Employees' Provident Fund or the Provident Fund of an establishment exempted under the said Act, is employed in his establishment, the employer shall immediately enrol him as a member of the Group Insurance Scheme and pay necessary premium in respect of him to the Life Insurance Corporation of India.

6. The employer shall arrange to enhance the benefits available to the employees under the Group Insurance Scheme appropriately, if the benefits available to the employees under the said Scheme are enhanced, so that the benefits available under the Group Insurance Scheme are more favourable to the employees than the benefits admissible under the said Scheme.

7. Notwithstanding anything contained in the Group Insurance Scheme, if on the death of an employee the amount payable under this scheme be less than the amount that would be payable had employee been covered under the said Scheme, the employer shall pay the difference to the legal heir/nominee of the employee as compensation.

8. No amendment of the provisions of the Group Insurance Scheme shall be made without the prior approval of the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Bihar and where any amendment is likely to affect adversely the interest of the employees, the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner shall before giving his approval, give a reasonable opportunity to the employees to explain their point of view.

9. Where, for any reason, the employees of the said establishment do not remain covered under the Group Insurance Scheme of the Life Insurance Corporation of India as already adopted by the said establishment, or the benefits to the employees under this Scheme are reduced in any manner, the exemption shall be liable to be cancelled.

10. Where, for any reason, the employer fails to pay the premium etc. within the due date, as fixed by the Life Insurance Corporation of India, and the policy is allowed to lapse, the exemption is liable to be cancelled.

11. In case of default, if any made by the employer in payment of premium the responsibility for payment of assurance benefits to the nominees or the legal heirs of deceased members who would have been covered under the said Scheme but for grant of this exemption, shall be that of the employer.

12. In the event of the death of the member covered under the Scheme, the employer in relation to the said establishment shall ensure prompt payment of the sum assured to the nominee/legal heirs entitled for it and in any case within 7 days of the receipt of the sum assured from the Life Insurance Corporation of India.

[No. S-35014(482)/82-PF.II]

का० आ० 849.—मैसर्स एसोसिएटेड सीमेन्ट कम्पनीज लिमिटेड, स्लेग ग्रेनूलेशन प्लांट, पो० बाक्स नं० 119, सकची जमशेदपुर-831001, बिहार (बिहार/1912) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त स्थापन कहा गया है) ने कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 17 की उपधारा (2क) के अधीन छूट दिए जाने के लिए आवेदन किया है:—

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त स्थापन के कर्मचारी, किसी पृथक अभिदाय या प्रीमियम का संदाय किए बिना ही, भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम की सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन जीवन बीमा के रूप में फायदे उठा रहे हैं, और ऐसे कर्मचारियों के लिए ये फायदे उन फायदों से अधिक अनुकूल हैं जो कर्मचारी निक्षेप सहबद्ध बीमा स्कीम 1976 (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त स्कीम कहा गया है) के अधीन उन्हें अनुज्ञेय हैं;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उपधारा (2क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए, उक्त स्थापन को तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए उक्त स्कीम के सभी उपबन्धों के प्रवर्तन से छूट देती है।

अनुसूची

1. उक्त स्थापन के संबंध में नियोजक प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त, बिहार को ऐसी विवरणियां भेजेगा और ऐसे लेखा रखेगा तथा निरीक्षण के लिए ऐसी सुविधाएं प्रदान करेगा जो केन्द्रीय सरकार, समय-समय पर निदिष्ट करे।

2. नियोजक, ऐमे निरीक्षण प्रभागों का प्रत्येक मास की समाप्ति के 15 दिन के भीतर सन्दाय करेगा जो केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उपधारा (3क) के खण्ड (क) के अधीन समय-समय पर निर्दिष्ट करे।

3. सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के प्रणामन में, जिसके अन्तर्गत लेखाओं का रखा जाना, विवरणियों का प्रस्तुत किया जाना, बीमा प्रीमियम का सन्दाय, लेखाओं का अन्तरण, निरीक्षण प्रभागों का सन्दाय आदि भी है, होने वाले सभी व्ययों का वहन नियोजक द्वारा किया जाएगा।

4. नियोजक, केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा यथा अनुमोदित सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के नियमों की एक प्रति, और जब कभी उनमें संशोधन किया जाए, तब उस संशोधन की प्रति तथा कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या की भाषा में उसकी मुख्य बातों का अनुवाद, स्थापन के सूचना-पट्ट पर प्रदर्शित करेगा।

5. यदि कोई ऐसा कर्मचारी, जो कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि का या उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन छूट प्राप्त किसी स्थापन की भविष्य निधि का पहले ही सदस्य है, उसके स्थापन में नियोजित किया जाता है तो, नियोजक सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के सदस्य के रूप में उसका नाम तुरन्त दर्ज करेगा और उसकी वास्तव आवश्यक प्रीमियम भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम को सँदत्त करेगा।

6. यदि उक्त स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को उपलब्ध फायदे बढ़ाए जाते हैं तो, नियोजक सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों का उपलब्ध फायदों में समुचित रूप से वृद्धि की जाने की व्यवस्था करेगा, जिसमें कि कर्मचारियों के लिए सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन उपलब्ध फायदे उन फायदों से अधिक अनुकूल हों जो उक्त स्कीम के अधीन अनुज्ञेय हैं।

7. सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम में किसी बात के होते हुए भी, यदि किसी कर्मचारी को मृत्यु पर इस स्कीम के अधीन संदेय रकम उस रकम से कम है, जो कर्मचारी को उस दशा में संदेय होती, जब वह उक्त स्कीम के अधीन होता तो, नियोजक कर्मचारी के विधिक वारिस/नाम निर्देशितों को प्रतिकर के रूप में दोनों रकमों के अन्तर के बराबर रकम का सँदाय करेगा।

8. सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के उपबन्धों में कोई भी संशोधन, प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त, बिहार के पूर्व अनुमोदन के बिना नहीं किया जायेगा और जहां किसी संशोधन से कर्मचारियों के हित पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव पड़ने की संभावना हो वहां, प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त अपना अनुमोदन देने से पूर्व कर्मचारियों को अपना दृष्टिकोण स्पष्ट करने का युक्तियुक्त अवसर देगा।

9. यदि किसी कारणवश, स्थापन के कर्मचारी, भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम की उस सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के, जिसे स्थापन पहले अपना चुका है अधीन नहीं रह जाते हैं, या इस स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को प्राप्त होने वाले फायदे किसी रीति से कम हो जाते हैं, तो यह छूट रद्द की जा सकती है।

10 यदि किसी कारणवश, नियोजक उस नियत तारीख के भीतर जो भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम नियत करे, प्रीमियम का सँदाय करने में असफल रहता है, और पालिसी को व्ययगत हो जाने दिया जाता है तो छूट रद्द की जा सकती है।

11. नियोजक द्वारा प्रीमियम के सँदाय में किए गए किसी व्यतिक्रम की दशा में उन मृत सदस्यों के नामनिर्देशितियों या विधिक वारिसों को जो यदि यह, छूट न दी गई होती तो उक्त स्कीम के अन्तर्गत होते, बीमा फायदों के सँदाय का उत्तरदायित्व नियोजक पर होगा।

12. उक्त स्थापन के संबंध में नियोजक, इस स्कीम के अधीन आने वाले किसी सदस्य की मृत्यु होने पर उसके हकदार नाम निर्देशितियों/विधिक वारिसों को बीमाकृत रकम का सँदाय तत्परता से और प्रत्येक दशा में भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम से बीमाकृत रकम प्राप्त होने के सात दिन के भीतर सुनिश्चित करेगा।

[संख्या एस०-35014/483/82-पी० एफ०-2]

ए० के० भट्टराई, अवर सचिव

S.O. 849.—Whereas Messrs The Associated Cement Companies Ltd., Slag Granulation Plant, P.B. No. 119, Sakchi, Jamshedpur-831001, Bihar (BR/1912) (hereinafter referred to as the said establishment) have applied for exemption under sub-section (2A) of section 17 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act (19 of 1952) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act);

And whereas, the Central Government is satisfied that the employees of the said establishment are, without making any separate contribution or payment of premium, in enjoyment of benefits under the Group Insurance Scheme of the Life Insurance Corporation of India in the nature of Life Insurance which are more favourable to such employees than the benefit, admissible under the Employees Deposit-Linked Insurance Scheme, 1976 (hereinafter referred to as the said Scheme);

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2A) of section 17 of the said Act and subject to the conditions specified in the Schedule annexed hereto, the Central Government hereby exempts the said establishment from the operation of all the provisions of the said Scheme for a period of three years.

SCHEDULE

1. The employer in relation to the said establishment shall submit such returns to the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Bihar, maintain such accounts and provide such facilities for inspection, as the Central Government may direct from time to time.

2. The employer shall pay such inspection charges as the Central Government may, from time to time, direct under clause (a) of sub-section (3A) of section 17 of the said Act, within 15 days from the close of every month.

3. All expenses involved in the administration of the Group Insurance Scheme, including maintenance of accounts, submission of returns, payment of insurance premia, transfer of accounts, payment of inspection charges etc. shall be borne by the employer.

4. The employer shall display on the Notice Board of the establishment, a copy of the rules of the Group Insurance Scheme as approved by the Central Government and, as and when amended, alongwith a translation of the salient features thereof, in the language of the majority of the employees.

5. Whereas an employee, who is already a member of the Employees' Provident Fund or the Provident Fund of an establishment exempted under the said Act is employed in his establishment, the employer shall immediately enrol him as a member of the Group Insurance Scheme and pay the -

sary premium in respect of him to the Life Insurance Corporation of India.

6. The employer shall arrange to enhance the benefits available to the employees under the Group Insurance Scheme appropriately, if the benefits available to the employees under the said Scheme are enhanced, so that the benefits available under the Group Insurance Scheme are more favourable to the employees than the benefits admissible under the said Scheme.

7. Notwithstanding anything contained in the Group Insurance Scheme, if on the death of an employee the amount payable under this scheme be less than the amount that would be payable had employee been covered under the said Scheme, the employer shall pay the difference to the legal heir/nominee of the employee as compensation.

8. No amendment of the provisions of the Group Insurance Scheme shall be made without the prior approval of the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Bihar and where an amendment is likely to affect adversely the interest of the employees, the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner shall before giving his approval, give a reasonable opportunity to the employees to explain their point of view.

9. Where, for any reason, the employees of the said establishment do not remain covered under the Group Insurance Scheme of the Life Insurance Corporation of India as already adopted by the said establishment or the benefits to the employees under this Scheme are reduced in any manner, the exemption shall be liable to be cancelled.

10. Where, for any reason the employer fails to pay the premium etc. within the due date, as fixed by the Life Insurance Corporation of India, and the policy is allowed to lapse, the exemption is liable to be cancelled.

11. In case of default, if any made by the employer in payment of premium the responsibility for payment of assurance benefits to the nominees or the legal heirs of deceased members who would have been covered under the said Scheme but for grant of this exemption, shall be that of the employer.

12. Upon the death of the member covered under the Scheme the employer in relation to the said establishment shall ensure prompt payment of the sum assured to the nominee/legal heirs entitled for it and in any case within 7 days of the receipt of the sum assured from the Life Insurance Corporation of India.

[No. S-35014(493)/80 D.P.H.]
A. K. BHATTARAI Under Secy

नई दिल्ली, 22 जनवरी, 1983

का० आ० 850.—चुना पत्थर और डोलोमाइट खान श्रम कल्याण अधिनियम, 1972 (1972 का 62) की धारा 7 के माध्य पठित चुना पत्थर और डोलोमाइट खान श्रम कल्याण निधि नियम, 1973 के नियम 3 के उप नियम (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 3005 तारीख 15 अक्टूबर, 1981, जो भारत के राजपत्र भाग II, खण्ड 3, उप खण्ड (ii) में दिनांक 31 अक्टूबर, 1981 को प्रकाशित हुई का निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में क्रम संख्या 5 (iv) के प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित रखी जाएगी, अर्थात् :—

“5 (iv) श्री एन० एस० मल्लीवाल,

सुपरिन्टेंडेंट (खान) ग्रुप “बी०”

टाटा आयरन एण्ड स्टील कंपनी लिमिटेड पम्पोश”

[फा० सं० यू० 23018/10/80-एम०-5 डब्ल्यू० II]

टी०डी० सनहोत्रा, प्रवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 22nd January, 1983

S.O. 850.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 7 of the Limestone and Dolomite Mines Labour Welfare Fund Act, 1972 (62 of 1972) read with sub-rule (1) of rule 3 of the Limestone and Dolomite Mines Labour Welfare Fund Rules, 1973, the Central Government hereby makes the following amendments in the notification number S. O. 3005 dated the 15th October, 1981, of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour published at pages 3583 to 3584 of the Gazette of India, Part-II Section 3, sub section (a) dated 31st October, 1981, namely :—

In the said notification, for the entry against serial number 5(iv), the following shall be substituted namely :—

“5(iv) Mr. N. S. Malliwai,
Superintendent (Mines),
Group ‘B’

The Tata Iron and Steel Company Limited,
Pamposh”. (Orissa).

[F. No. U-23018/10/80 M. V/W. II]
T. D. SANHOTRA, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 28th January, 1983

S.O. 851.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 3, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Ratibati Colliery of Messrs Eastern Coalfields Limited, Post Office Kalipahari, District Burdwan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 18-1-1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT NO. 3, DHANBAD

Reference No. 74/80

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Ratibati Colliery of Eastern Coalfields Ltd., Kalipahari (Burdwan).

AND

Their workman

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri N. Das, Advocate.

For the Workman—Shri C. S. Mukherjee, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Coal

STATE : West Bengal.

Dated, the 11th January, 1983

AWARD

The Government of India in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them U/S 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 14 of 1947 referred the dispute to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Calcutta. Subsequently by Order No. S-11025(4)/80-D IV(B) dated the 14th/17th November, 1980 the dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication.

SCHEDULE

“In view of the letter of authorisation dated 25-1-72 from the Colliery Manager, Ratibati Colliery and letter of authorisation dated 15-2-73 from the Custodian Ratibati Group of C.M.A. Ltd., whether relationship of employer and employee existed between Shri Swarnan Kumar Banerjee, Grand-son of Gosta Behari Banerjee and the Ratibati Colliery of

Eastern Coalfield, Limited, P.O. Kalipahari, Burdwan? If so, whether the action of the management of Ratibati Colliery in making Shri Swapan Kumar Banerjee suddenly idle with effect from 24-6-74 from the employment of Weigh Bridge Clerk of Aatibati Colliery was justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. The case of the workman is that he is Grand Son of Shri Gosta Behari Banerjee, a permanent Weigh Bridge Clerk of Ratibati Colliery and that the concerned workman Shri Swapan Kumar Banerjee actually worked and performed the duties of Weigh Bridge Clerk in place of his Grand Father. It is stated that even after nationalisation of the colliery under the express permission of the Custodian of Coal Mines Authority Ltd., the concerned workman was allowed to continue to work in place of his Grand Father. It is submitted that the concerned workman worked in place of the Grand Father since before nationalisation under proper authority from 25-1-72 to 23-6-74 and he was paid monthly wages and other emoluments billed for his Grand Father Shri Gosta Behari Banerjee but in fact the concerned workman was the real person who carried the work.

3. It is alleged that all of a sudden on 24-6-76 the management illegally and arbitrarily stopped the concerned workman from doing his duty and failed to regularise his employment even after representation made by the concerned workman. An industrial dispute was raised and after conciliation failed the present Reference has been made. The demand of the concerned workman is that he should be given employment with full back wages.

4. The defence of the management is that Sri Gosta Behari Banerjee was working as a common employee of various collieries including the Ratibati Colliery. At the request of Shri Gosta Behari Banerjee due to his illness the concerned workman was allowed to perform his duty in his place and that it was a part-time employment. After take over the Custodian also thought it prudent to accept the said proposal of Shri Gosta Behari Banerjee and agreed that the concerned workman should work in his place till he was ill and a letter of authorisation addressed to the Head Weigh Bridge Clerk, Eastern Railway was issued by the Custodian on 15-2-73.

5. It is submitted that the said letter of authorisation did not confirm any status as an employee or workman upon the concerned workman because this was simply a concession granted to Shri Gosta Behari Banerjee to receive the benefit of his monthly wages by getting his work managed and performed by his Grand Son Sri Swapan Kumar Banerjee. It is also submitted that Sri Swapan Kumar Banerjee never became an employee of the management and he was never paid any wages for the said work nor he was ever entitled to get any such payment. It is also stated that after nationalisation when other employees were properly categorised Sri Gosta Behari Banerjee was also taken into consideration and he was placed in Clerical Grade III with effect from 15-8-73 and was asked to resume his duties but he did not accept the same. The main defence of the management thus it that there was never any relation of employer and employee between the concerned workman and the management and so the concerned workman is not entitled to any relief.

6. The point for consideration is as to whether the concerned workman is entitled to the relief as claimed.

7. From a perusal of the schedule of the Reference itself it will appear that the decision of the case hinges on the two letters dated 25-1-72 and 15-2-73. The letter dated 25-1-72 is under the signature of the manager of erstwhile Mining Company addressed to the Head Weigh Bridge Clerk, Andal Weigh Bridge. By this letter the Head Weigh Bridge Clerk was informed that Shri Swapan Kumar Banerjee Grand Son of Shri Gosta Behari Banerjee was authorised to take delivery of the railway receipts and other despatching documents from the Weigh Bridge with effect from that day as Sri Gosta Behari Banerjee had been granted leave from that date. On the basis of this letter the concerned workman began to work in place of his Grand-Father. Ext. M-1 is an application dated 10-2-73 sent by Shri Gosta Behari Banerjee to the Custodian, Ratibati Colliery. By this letter Shri Gosta Behari Banerjee requested the Custodian that his Grand Son Shri Swapan Kumar Banerjee may be allowed to work on his behalf till he recovers from his disablement. It appears that on the basis of this letter the Custodian wrote a letter dated 15-2-73 (Ext. W-2) to the Head Weigh Bridge Clerk by which he was informed that it was reported that Shri Gosta Behari Banerjee, permanent Weigh Bridge Clerk was unable to attend to his duty owing to sickness and therefore he authorised his Grand-son Shri Swapan Kumar Banerjee to work in his place till Sri Gosta Behari Banerjee resumed his duties.

8. Thus from the above two letters it will appear that the concerned workman did not get any employment either under the erstwhile owner or under the present management and he was only allowed to perform duties of his Grand Father who was lying ill. The concerned workman has examined himself as WW-1 and according to him Exts. W-1 and W-2 are his letters of appointment. But apparently that is not so. The above two letters are also not addressed to the concerned workman. The concerned workman has also admitted in para 5 of his cross-examination that the salary bills were prepared in the name of his Grand Father and that no salary bill was ever prepared in his name. Thus from the above evidence as also the documents referred to above, it is clear that the concerned workman was never appointed either by the erstwhile owner or by the present management to work under them. In fact only an authority was given to the concerned workman to work in place of the Grand Father for some period.

9. The workman has not denied that after nationalisation his Grand Father was regularised and he was directed to work but he did not join.

10. Considering the above evidence, I hold that there was no relationship of employer and employee between the concerned workman and the present management and so the concerned workman is not entitled to any relief.

11. I give my award accordingly.

J. N. SINGH, Presiding Officer
[No. L-19012(16)/78-D.IV(B)]
S. S. MEHTA, Desk Officer.